

816

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Chap. HC 255

Shelf .K 5

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

SOCIAL POLITICS.

GLASGOW:
PRINTED BY ALEX. M'DOUGALL,
60 MITCHELL STREET.

SOCIAL POLITICS

IN

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

BY

PROFESSOR KIRK, EDINBURGH.

INSCRIBED TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE W. E. GLADSTONE.



LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO.

GLASGOW: THOMAS D. MORISON.

1870.

HC255
K5

To

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE W. E. GLADSTONE,

FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY.

It is with a deep conviction, Right Honourable Sir, of your pre-eminent qualifications to occupy worthily, and to the great advantage of the British nation, the high official position to which by your merits you have been raised, that the writer of the following pages begs to inscribe them to you. Whatever may be the opinion which you may be led to entertain of the views propounded, their drift is so nearly in the direction of a policy to which your life seems devoted, that they are hopefully placed in your hands by,

Right Honourable Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

THE AUTHOR.

P R E F A C E.

AMONG the last things in a book which have to be written is the Preface; but it should be among the first to be read. It is like the few words with which an apt chairman opens the way for a stranger who is about to address the audience over which he presides; only, it usually consists of words addressed by the author himself, and not by another.

Our desire in this preface is to give the reader some idea of what he will find if he carefully peruses the volume. He will first of all have a brief glance at the more important features of the vast wealth to be found in the resources of this great and united kingdom. He will then be led to look at the amazing inequality with which this great wealth is distributed—the riches and the poverty of the land. He will be invited also to consider at some length the relation of the population to the resources of the country, so that the now crowded and dying masses may be seen in the mind's eye where they ought to be in reality. He will be urged to ponder the momentous question as to how crowding and

death, with all the attendants of a terrible poverty, prevail in a land which is capable of sustaining twice its present population; and he will be urged also to ponder the remedies that may be applied to the present state of things.

It may be well to tell him that he will not find the now familiar arguments urged in favour of "teetotalism," because the book is strictly political and not personal. From beginning to end he will find himself among "politics" strictly so-called. This is not because these politics are truly separable from the physiological, moral, and religious aspects of the great drink system, with its kindred tobacco traffic; but because it seems to the author that men need to have their minds directed above all to the great principles of political existence, in the present state of the British Empire.

Headed by the admirable Alliance, we have a marvellous staff of workers in reform in the United Kingdom, and the author ventures to hope that he may be useful in the way of laying such facts to hand, at least for some of these, as may help them in their great work. He has found in other days that the truth, startling and strange at first sight, has become gradually the accepted faith even of those who could regard

it as only extravagance for a time. He will not be disappointed if this should be repeated in relation to more than one of the statements and calculations of the present volume.

The reader will find the remedies suggested, both by working men and by others, discussed in the latter part of the volume. The subject of emigration, together with that of lessening production, and several kindred ideas, fall to be earnestly considered in the present state of our country. We are fast losing that place in the world in which our advantages have excelled those of other States. Especially in North America, communities are rapidly rising to a position in which we shall be no longer able to compete with them in the world's market, if our deteriorating processes go on. And the working millions have need specially to consider the truth that bears on this prospect.

The astounding effect of fifteen years' restriction of our liquor system, chiefly by high duties, will not fail to interest the reformer as he comes near the close of the volume. These remedial measures have just doubled the impoverishing drain of money from the lower orders to the higher, so far as spirits are concerned. They have added more than £20,000,000 to the liquor bill of the toiling

masses. It is to be hoped that the discussion of such facts will lead to further investigation and to greater light; and that the now numerous constituency of this great nation will be led to rouse itself to the work of full deliverance. Let all be assured that no time must be lost if we are ever to rise as a people to our proper place among the nations.

J. K.

EDINBURGH, *April, 1870.*

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER	PAGE
I.—EXTENT OF SURFACE,	1
II.—FISHERIES,	4
III.—AGRICULTURE,	7
IV.—MINES AND QUARRIES,	9
V.—MANUFACTURES,	11
VI.—COMMERCE,	14
VII.—PROPERTY,	17
VIII.—POPULATION,	20
IX.—INTELLIGENCE,	23
X.—DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH,	28
XI.—EMPLOYMENT OF INCOME,	31
XII.—DISTRIBUTION OF LAND,	35
XIII.—THE POSITION OF FARMERS,	39
XIV.—POPULATION OF THE SEABOARD,	42
XV.—POPULATION ON FRESH WATERS,	47
XVI.—UNPRODUCTIVE SURFACE,	51
XVII.—A GRAZING POPULATION,	56
XVIII.—OUR AGRICULTURAL POPULATION,	61
XIX.—WHERE ARE THE PEOPLE?	65
XX.—CROWDING AND DEATH,	72
XXI.—LAND AND LIQUOR,	77
XXII.—DISASTROUS EXCHANGE,	81
XXIII.—WAGES, DRINK, AND TOBACCO,	91
XXIV.—IMPROVIDENCE,	97
XXV.—MONEY AND LAND,	102

CHAPTER	PAGE
XXVI.—INCIDENCE OF TAXATION,	108
XXVII.—EMIGRATION,	112
XXVIII.—DIMINISHING FORCE,	119
XXIX.—LESSENING PRODUCTION,	132
XXX.—“CHEAPENING LABOUR,”	144
XXXI.—WHO IS TO BLAME?	156
XXXII.—WHAT IS TO BE DONE?	162
XXXIII.—OWNERS’ RIGHTS,	166
XXXIV.—OCCUPIERS’ RIGHTS,	172
XXXV.—PALLIATIVE MEASURES,	184
XXXVI.—THE DUTY OF WORKING MEN,	190

SOCIAL POLITICS.

CHAPTER I.

EXTENT OF SURFACE.

To know any country it is well to consider it first as a portion of the habitable surface of the globe. Its extent and character come thus before us as primary elements in all calculations that can be made as to its capabilities in relation to that portion of the human race which is, or may be, its population.

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland embraces not only the dry land of all the islands which go to constitute the *terra firma* of our native land, together with all its inland waters, but also that portion of the sea which is embraced by a line drawn at a distance of three miles beyond low water mark from its coasts. "British waters" are as important in view of the very sustenance of the people, as is the best of British land, and they are just as sacredly guarded.

In estimating the extent of the country we must therefore take into account these three miles of ocean all round. We begin three miles north of the farthest

of the Shetlands, and measure to three miles south of the Lizard. That is about 785 statute miles. Then we take from three miles east of Yarmouth across to the same distance west of the Blaskets, on the farthest point of Ireland. That is a distance of 535 miles. We have thus the greatest length, and the greatest breadth of that portion of the earth's surface on which about thirty millions of men, women, and children at present have their home. A right angled triangle whose base is 500 miles and whose perpendicular is 700 would represent this extent of surface exactly enough for our present purpose. This would give us 175,000 square miles of sea and land together as the full extent of our country.

It is necessary to include this wide area, in order to have a correct view of the United Kingdom, because of the character of the surface. No part of the space we have embraced in our estimate is useless. The great channels which are included are the now crowded ways by which our commerce is constantly passing. The fresh water lakes that occupy so much surface, especially in Scotland, are available as reservoirs of the greatest importance. Witness Loch Katrine and the city of Glasgow, now so copiously supplied from it; and the vast capabilities of the water power yet unused in the case of other sheets of water. Even the highest mountain tops, as they arrest and condense the clouds, and send down a fertile irrigation for the valleys and plains, have the highest material value.

The three miles of ocean all round our coasts are not only rich in harbourage, but also full of fish, and so capable of supplying human wants—even more abundantly than the best of the land. But all this will appear much more fully as we go on to consider the resources of the kingdom. It is when we take up these with care, so as to form a full idea of the capabilities of the country, that we are enabled to understand the wondrous value of that *variety of surface* which characterizes the islands in which we live. It is not so much the arable land of a country that accounts for its richness, as that conformation and character above ground and below ground which accounts for land being arable, which makes its crops highly valuable, and affords means of easy interchange between its various districts, and also with other trading countries.

CHAPTER II.

FISHERIES.

WE have only to glance at the imperfect statistics of our fisheries in order to see the importance of that three-mile belt of ocean which is embraced in our country's surface as "British waters." Some idea of the value of the food which is at present derived from this source may be gathered from the number of men and boys employed in the fisheries of Scotland and the Isle of Man, say in 1867. They amounted to 46,219, manning altogether 14,208 boats of various classes. Though this vast army of fishers do not live altogether by fishing, they depend in great measure for their support during the year on what they gain during the fishing season. Some additional idea may be got from the number of men and boats employed in the Irish fisheries, say in 1846. We select this year because it represents what was actually reached on the coast of Ireland before the fatal famine, by which the productive power was so dreadfully lowered. The number of men and boys employed in Irish fisheries in that year was 113,073, and the boats amounted to 19,883. In 1866 the men and boys had fallen to 40,663, and the boats to 9,444! The capabilities of the fisheries had not lessened, but rather increased. We have therefore

in these two statements the actual employment of 159,292 men and boys, involving a very much larger number of women, children, and persons ministering to the wants of fishermen and their families, all to a great extent sustained from our coast fisheries in Scotland, with the Isle of Man, and Ireland alone. But this gives us no adequate view of the resources of even Scotch and Irish waters. The Select Committee that sat in 1867 on "Irish fisheries" state their belief that these, like others, might be developed to a very large extent "beyond their present rate of produce."*

The most important paper which we have on the fisheries of the United Kingdom is probably the Report of the Royal Commission which is dated in 1866. These Commissioners say,—“The produce of the sea around our coasts bears a far higher proportion to that of the land than is generally imagined. The most frequented fishing grounds are much more prolific of food than the same extent of the richest land. Once in the year an acre of good land carefully tilled produces a ton of corn, or two hundredweight or three hundredweight of meat or cheese. The same area, at the bottom of the sea, on the best fishing grounds, yields a greater weight of food to the persevering fisherman every week in the year. Five vessels belonging to the same owner, in a single night's fishing, brought in 17 tons weight of fish, an amount of wholesome food equal to that of

* Parliamentary paper 443, 1867.

50 cattle or 300 sheep. The ground which these vessels covered could not have exceeded an area of 50 acres.”*

It is not easy to get any exact idea of the produce of our fisheries, especially on the English coast. Vast quantities are caught and sold of which no record of any kind is taken. But the quantities passing over the railways are such as to give a very large amount as the probable sum of all that are caught. In 1864, the fish passing over twelve of our chief railways weighed 122,381 tons—that is, equal to above 5,000,000 sheep. About 1,000 sail, together with the railways, are employed in supplying London alone with above 80,000 tons of fish annually. Though we have no means of forming an exact estimate of the quantity of food thus brought to us from the sea, we have means enough to give us the conviction that it is capable of feeding a large portion of the people; besides, it might be doubled, or as one witness before the Commissioners said, it might be easily “trebled.”

* See Report of the Commissioners appointed to enquire into the Sea Fisheries of the United Kingdom, 1866, p. xvii.

CHAPTER III.

AGRICULTURE.

WHEN we come on the dry land and look at its capabilities, it is natural first to consider the bread and meat produced in agriculture. The total acreage of Great Britain and Ireland, including the Channel Islands, is given by authority of Government at 77,513,000 statute acres. The portion of this under crops and grass is stated at 45,652,545 acres.* This gives about an acre and a-half for every soul of the population,—and that of actually productive land. That is, suppose we had no fisheries, nor any other resources, and had to live on the produce of the land alone, without taking in an acre of that which now lies waste (much of which is reclaimable), we have an acre and a-half of productive soil for each individual of the people. How does this look beside the statements of those who cry out for emigration, because these islands are too strait for us? We may look first at the cattle, sheep, and pigs on this acreage in 1868, as we have them authoritatively stated. The cattle amounted to 9,083,416,—the sheep were 35,607,812,—the pigs were 3,189,167. Put sheep on the grass now unhappily given up to deer, and make that of the waste land which an industrious and frugal people will easily make of it, and

* Agricultural Returns for 1868.

these cattle of all sorts will be easily increased ; but take the quantities as they stand, and how do they look side by side with famishing thousands for whom it is now clamoured that they be sent out of the land ? One acre of good corn land will grow bread enough for five men. In 1868 there were 11,659,855 acres under corn crops, and they must have borne bread enough for 58,299,275 persons of full grown eating power ! How then comes scarcity of bread ? In asking this question we are keeping out of sight a vast quantity of good grain that came to us from other countries. At present we speak only of the resources of our own country, in order that we may lay the foundation on which to consider its social politics. When we look at our food supplies as these actually come to us from the hand of a bountiful Providence, and see that there must be more than enough in the land for man and for beast, it does seem a tremendous question how so many are perishing for want.

But we have not only food supplies. Thirty-four millions of sheep imply a vast amount of wool as well as food. They give more than a fleece for every man, woman, and child of the whole population. How is it that so many thousands are naked, so far as decent rags even are concerned ? We have not yet come to commerce, and so look not at the vast sum of other clothing materials that reaches us by sea from other lands. It is the resources of our own land we are estimating, and yet we find food and clothing enough for the entire people !

CHAPTER IV.

MINES AND QUARRIES.

HAVING looked at the fisheries and agriculture as sources of supply we naturally go beneath the surface and consider the mining wealth of this rich country. Here it is that we get not only our own supply of minerals and metals, but that enormous power that brings to so large an extent the supplies of other lands to our shores. But for our coal and iron enabling us to export to so large an extent, we could not possibly import as we do of the food, clothing, and other comforts produced by other peoples. It is when we come to our mining capabilities that we approach the sources from which a portion of the people now draw, not their sustenance, but the means of an extravagance almost unparalleled. The value of our entire produce from mines in 1867, at the place of production, amounted to £41,183,158.

This is the value of the coals and ore alone, before any process of manufacture has added to their worth, and is a very large sum indeed. As our great export shows, it is vastly beyond the consumption of the population of this country; and proves that, so far as fuel and metals for all needful purposes are concerned, these islands have far more than resources enough for double their people as they now stand.

These mineral statistics, too, leave out of sight the enormous quantities of stone and slate for building purposes that are produced annually in the United Kingdom, together with the great amount of building of all sorts actually accomplished. In 1867 there were 664,498 houses assessed for house tax, at a rental of £32,737,771. That was nearly a million sterling above the rental of 1866, and that again was more than two millions above the annual value of the houses assessed in 1865. A similar increase in the value of house property is now going on, as the result of the great productive power of the people; and yet, in spite of all this amazing output of mineral and material wealth from under the surface of the land on which we live, and also this great amount of actual house building in one year, the want of houses to shelter them, on the part of thousands on thousands of the population, is truly overwhelming. If we put the value of minerals and rent of buildings together, we have the vast aggregate of £73,920,929 as an addition to the wealth of the people, in one year, from these two sources alone; and that is leaving out of sight the value of all those houses that do not fall within the assessable limit. That additional income from mines and buildings alone is above £2, 10s. for every soul in the population. It is equal to £15 a year for fuel and house room for every family of six, and that is no mean supply.

CHAPTER V.

MANUFACTURES.

WHAT we have said of the fisheries, the bread growing, the cattle raising, with the mines and dwellings of the United Kingdom, is more than sufficient to show the full adequacy of the country itself to supply the population with food, clothing, fuel, and dwellings, and also with the raw material of most important manufactures. Keeping out of sight altogether its being a sort of "workshop of the world," as some are fond of calling Great Britain especially, it is clearly capable of being a well-supplied workshop for its own people, even if they were double their present number, and had nothing to send off to other countries. In the manufacture of fabrics for the clothing of the people, no less than 857,964 persons were employed in 1868. In steam power there was that of 337,851 horses, and in water power that of 29,830. This power was turning no less than 41,516,484 spindles; that is, leaving out 2,975,231 doubling spindles, and stating the spinning ones alone. There were 549,365 powerlooms also at work. If each of these looms were sufficient to weave for sixty persons only, we should have more than weaving power for the whole population; yet that would be

ridiculously below the capacity of such a machine. Altogether, there were not less than 3,416,253 persons engaged in producing clothing, even in 1861, when the population was under what it was in 1868. This is clear from the census. With such a power of cloth and clothes-making, it does seem incomprehensible that millions of the people should be, as nearly as possible, absolutely destitute of suitable covering. Yet so they are.

Our manufacturing capabilities, however, are not at all exhausted by efforts to clothe mankind. When we have further recourse to the census of 1861, we find that, independently of our fishermen, our agriculturists, and those occupied in manufacturing textile materials and clothing, we had in the United Kingdom 3,415,938 persons actually engaged in adding to the wealth of the community by other industrial processes. A portion of this multitude are anticipated by implication in our chapter on mines and dwellings; but all the vast numbers employed in iron manufacture, and in the entire metallic system by which our national income is so largely increased, are over and above all who are engaged in finding the raw material merely. The vast machinery implied in our railroad system, and in all else by which metals are made to serve us, form part of this huge army of productive persons. We have no means of estimating exactly the sum of wealth thus created every year; but, as in the case of the fisheries, we have enough to satisfy any one, who thinks

on the subject, that it must be very great indeed. And yet, for actual want, tens of thousands desire to flee the country for ever !

It is one of the most interesting questions that can engage a thoughtful mind at the present hour, how vast numbers of warehouses are full of cloth, and vast numbers of pawnbroking establishments full of clothes, while so many thousands of the people are nearly as badly off for dress as if we were a nation of savages. It is greatly for the purpose of stirring up such a question that we thus state our country's resources in this and in other respects. Let every reader be sure that the answer is as interesting as is the question.

CHAPTER VI.

COMMERCE.

IF we take as an illustration one of those families, partly agricultural, and partly manufacturing, such as we have had in greater numbers than now in various parts of our country, it will aid us in seeing how commerce affects a nation. Such a family is capable of raising the greater part of its own food, fuel, clothing, and house-room,—at the same time of manufacturing a considerable amount of what is needed to supply the wants of families at a distance. Its members have to go forth for raw materials, to some extent, on which to exercise their skill; but they soon carry forth goods of much greater value, and bring home either other goods which they want, or money, by which they gradually become “capitalists,” and are able to increase their productive powers in various ways. Such a family is a nation in miniature; and it is easy to see that if the balance in cash which they are annually able to bring home is considerable, they must be in a very good way. If it should be so, and any of their productive members are in destitution, there must be something sadly wrong in that family. In 1868 our merchants were able to send away goods to the value of £227,588,663; but they were able to bring home goods to the value

of £295,511,566. That shows an increase of wealth by a balance of £67,922,903. There is a most important consideration that might fall to be expressed here; but we leave it for another chapter, and take the figures as they stand before us, for they correctly enough show the power in the nation to increase real wealth as represented by money value. As a people, and that in a very feeble state of trade, we are able to increase the real wealth of the nation by £67,922,903 in one twelvemonth's time. Nor is this all. We send out gold and silver as well as goods, and receive gold and silver as well as goods in our import trade. In 1868 we sent out £20,220,014 in coin; but we brought back £24,852,595. That made us richer by the sum of £4,632,581 in gold and silver, as we were £67,922,903 richer in goods of value. That is, £72,555,434 fairly earned by the industrial and trading energy of the people, thousands of whom are in such poverty that the rest do not know how to dispose of them !

This vast sum is not reduced by the expense of transit, in which we maintain a commercial marine unequalled in the world, because the value of our exports is not that which they will bear after they have been carried to their destination, but that at which they would sell at the port from which they go. The value of our imports is not that at which they are bought at the places from whence they came, but the price at which they will sell when landed at our own Custom Houses. The

shipper is paid out of the balance which we find by comparing the price of his cargo at the port at which he ships it and its higher value at the port at which he delivers it. The vast property accumulated in shipping, is all in addition to that which is accumulated by foreign trade, whose profits are represented by the sum we have just put before our readers; and surely it does urge the question upon us, as to how a nation able to win such a sum in commerce in one year, can be the prey of devouring pauperism. Such a question must be pressed until the masses in the community shall have got full hold of its true answer. Beyond all doubt our wealth and our poverty are both increasing. The seeming contradiction can be explained; and the people must be made to understand the explanation.

CHAPTER VII.

PROPERTY.

IN the actual produce of a country, we see its resources in one of their most important aspects; but there is an equally important aspect seen in its accumulated wealth. We have looked at the annual addition made to the dwellings of the population in connection with our mines and quarries, but we see the matter in another and more forcible view when we consider the value of all which we now possess as available property. A people might be able to bring a great deal of actual food from the waters and from the land, and also to produce a large amount of useful materials from its mines, and yet have very little actual property on the strength of which to extend its productive power. We look, therefore, with deep interest to the estimated value of the property of the United Kingdom.

One interesting way of reaching an idea of the property of this country, is by means of the Insurance effected upon it. This does not give us its actual value, because much valuable property is not insured. Yet in the year 1867 there was the enormous sum of £1,365,325,000 insured upon property in the United Kingdom. That would

give above £45 in insured property to every man, woman, and child in the country. It would be above £270 to every family of six persons.

This, however, does not give us anything like an adequate idea of the property of the Kingdom. A vast amount of that is not insured at all. Land needs no insurance, and in the year ending 5th April, 1867, income tax was charged on the annual value of this kind of property rated at £125,249,705. The actual value of this cannot be under twenty years' purchase, which would be £2,504,994,100, or above £84 a head for the whole population. That added to the £45 would give £129 to each, and to every family of father, mother, and four children no less than £774 in property. That is, counting only such valuable accumulations as are deemed worthy of insurance, and the land, which does not need it, we have as much as would place every family in these realms in a position of comfort; so far as actual property is concerned.

We must, however, take in the accumulated capital which is found in the form of money. This is not in any way included in the insured property, and is wealth distinct from the land. If we take the gold held by the Bank of England, say in December, 1867, it was £20,603,285. The amount of coin held by Scotch and Irish banks at the same date was £5,509,516. These, together with coin held by the country banks in England, represent a very considerable amount of this medium of exchange with all the

world in the possession of the nation, though it seems a small sum when compared with the enormity of the transactions in which it plays an important part. There is, then, in addition to all this, the silver and gold in actual circulation, of which it is not easy to form anything like an accurate estimate.

We have now placed beyond all doubt that it is neither want of space, nor of resources, nor of property sufficient for its population, which is making it necessary to ship off tens of thousands of the people who are starving and dying for lack of room in which to breathe within the United Kingdom. He who ponders the statements we have laid before the readers of these pages will be in no danger of falling into the too prevalent error of thinking that the population has outgrown the country and its capabilities. He who desires five or ten times the space belonging to him as his proper share, cries out that the carriage is "full" long before its half is really occupied ; but he must wish fifty times at least what he needs who would crowd out his fellow-creatures from a country like this, situated as we are now.

CHAPTER VIII.

POPULATION.

THE number of souls in the United Kingdom in 1861, as found by the census of that year, was 29,070,932. The estimated number in 1867 was 30,157,473. If we take the large surface of sea and land fairly included in the space to which this aggregate belongs, it gives us about 172 for each square mile. We mention this large surface, because, though men do not live on the water in this country as they do in China, were the fisheries worked to the extent of which they are capable, and our commerce equally developed, there would be a vastly greater number supported by the produce of the sea than could be by that of a similar surface on the land. The Report of the Royal Commission on our coast fisheries, already referred to, makes this abundantly evident. As to the land, even to the tops of the highest mountains, it is equal one way or other to the support of this number of persons to the square mile. It is capable of improvement such as would double its present produce, even in the most bleak localities.

But when we turn attention to the population, it is not to their proportion in numbers to the extent of surface so much as to their capabilities fitting them

to deal with that surface effectively. It is when we take the number of grown men above twenty years of age, each individual of whom is capable of producing all necessities and comforts for at least six other persons on an average, that we see somewhat of the capabilities of a people. In England, in 1861, there were 5,230,573 men above twenty years of age. In Scotland 737,974. In Ireland age would seem of no account, as the census does not take it up, absurdly giving "religious profession" instead; but there were 1,844,793 men engaged in various "occupations," among whom "peers" and "bill-stickers" are put together, with an amusing variety besides.* That gives altogether 7,813,340 capable men for the United Kingdom. There is no deduction required for age which is not more than made up by the efficiency of youth. Were these men capable of earning ten shillings a week, on an average, during fifty weeks each year, their savings would amount to £195,333,500. All will admit that this is putting the capabilities of the men exceedingly low, even when we take in all in Ireland employed below twenty years of age. There are more than half as many women employed in actual labour—for which they are receiving wages—as there are men; showing that the capability of the population is at least a half above that at which we arrive when estimating from the men only. This would add a half to the above yearly sum. That gives the large amount of

* See *Census of Ireland* 1861, p. 724.

£293,000,250 as the easily reached result of productive work by such a people as that of these realms. But twenty shillings for the men, and ten for the women, would be a low average, if our estimate were founded on actual wages now received, taking in all occupations, high and low. That would be very far indeed below the actual value of the produce of labour resulting from the exertions of persons actually employed. We safely assert that the working strength of the entire people of this country (excluding, as the census does, the army, navy, and all merchant seamen abroad) is equal to an annual wage, on a fairly co-operative system, of not less than £500,000,000. That is, as near as may be, £20 a head for the entire population. That is, £120 a year to every family of six, as the product of labour alone. There is something terribly wrong when such a people are beggared by the ten thousand, and shipped off in starvation to other lands.

CHAPTER IX.

INTELLIGENCE.

THE great excitement at present apparent among certain classes, on the subject of "education," makes it specially important to look at the provision made for promoting the intelligence of the people, together with the measure in which that provision is accepted. One would be led to think that the population, whose resources and capabilities we have been pointing out in foregoing chapters, are semi-savages, and, from their ignorance of grammar and syntax, incapable of bringing their own bread from the soil. Some sort of law by which schools and teachers may be indefinitely increased in number and efficiency is spoken of as if it were the one want of the age. Many who will not consider the real cause of our social misery for a moment, will talk any length of time on the subject of education. Let us see, then, how this matter stands.

We shall begin with Ireland, where matters, in this as in other respects, are at the worst. It is in that beautiful country that the scourge of poverty has fallen first and most heavily; and it is from it that the tide of exile has flowed first and strongest. How is Ireland for schools? On the 31st December, 1867, there were 6,520 "*National*" schools in opera-

tion in Ireland. Besides these there were 3,820 "*Mixed*" schools,—that is, altogether, 10,340 schools for Ireland alone, and that by no means including all the schools in the country. The children on the rolls of these schools at the date mentioned numbered 1,444,850. That is, very nearly 25 per cent. of the whole population of Ireland on the roll of its primary schools. The average attendance shows an urgent need for some means of making those on the roll really attend at school. It was only 321,683; but the school room and number of teachers are more than sufficient for the larger number of scholars, as shown by the rolls. If we take the best educated county of Scotland, in 1861, so far as numbers at school are concerned, it was that of Clackmannan, and had only 18·2 per cent. of scholars to the population. From what we know of that county, we believe there was scarcely a child, whose attendance at school was really desirable, who was not actually attending. This gives us some idea of the absurdity of crying out for more means of "education," at least so far as Ireland is concerned. Looking to the census, we see that, in 1861, there were no less than 40,853 persons in Ireland "ministering to literature and education,"—that is exclusive of 10,627 who were "ministering to religion;"—that was 51,480 who were actually devoted to the enlightenment of the population. He is no statesman who does not consider that doverty may arise from an extreme in the number

of men and women taken from productive toil, such as increases the food of the people, and given up to work for the mind and spirit alone; nor can his mental vision be very clear who does not see that such an extreme is already having its bad effect in Ireland. Instead of more effective persons drawn off from material industry, it may be necessary to send back a good many to it who now live on the produce of others' hands.

Now we come to Scotland, as the next poorest of the "three kingdoms." If we confine attention at first to the "inspected schools," we had, in 1867, among an "agricultural people," 740 schools, with 769 certified teachers, aided by 344 pupil teachers, attended by 41,191 scholars as average attendance. Among "non-agricultural" people we had 550 schools, with 871 certified teachers, 1,314 pupil teachers, and 96,317 as the average number of scholars in attendance. Among a "mixed" population we had 383 schools, 461 certified teachers, 499 pupil teachers, and 38,086 scholars as the average attendance. These are "schools aided with annual grants," and these alone, yet they number 1,673, with 4,258 persons actually teaching 172,594 children in average attendance. The number actually present at examination was 181,572. There was accommodation in the schools in which these children were taught for 234,146 pupils. If we were to confine attention to primary schools—that is, schools for teaching the elements of a good plain education—we have

abundance for the whole people, so far as numbers of rooms and teachers are concerned.

But, to show how far the inspected schools of this aided class fall short of the total number in Scotland, we have only to refer to the census of 1851, where we find that the number of schools in Scotland was, even then, 5,242. We have not the number in 1861, as that was not given in the census of that year; but we know that the number has increased at a rate greatly beyond that of the increase in population. In 1861, "467,056 persons were 'tabulated' as scholars."* The entire population was then only 3,062,294. As much as 15·2 per cent., or one in every 6·5 persons, was receiving education at that date. Taken from the age of five to that of fifteen, the young of the whole country then amounted to only 685,912. There were then 12,456 persons who were entered in the census returns as "teachers," and hence, so far as both these and schools were concerned, there could and there can be no lack of the agencies of education in Scotland.

We come last, on this subject, to England, which has been making vast strides in education during the last ten years. In 1861 there were 110,364 persons "tabulated" as teachers. There were 3,150,048 described as scholars. That was in a population amounting altogether to 20,066,224. The entire number given, as from five to fifteen years of age, is 4,449,242; and hence there was not so very great a

* See *Census*, page lii.

lack of scholars in England, in proportion to the population, of an age where school is strictly the proper thing. Before five and after fourteen, as a rule for the great mass of the young in a country, it is extremely doubtful as to its being very desirable that a child should be at school. If our social state were as it should be, our children should have true childhood till five, and they might quite well learn something beyond school at fourteen. As we have said, the zeal exerted in the cause of education in England has done great things in the way of schools and teachers since 1861, and consequently the provision made has been greatly increased. There is no doubt great lack of a good education still in a considerable number of English youths, but it is not for want of means and agencies, but for lack of some compulsion strong enough to secure that sufficient use shall be made of the means and agencies existing in abundance.

This at least is certain, that if we take anything like a fair view of the education provided in these three kingdoms, and also of the degree to which the people are actually educated, it is impossible to conclude that the vast misery existing in the midst of resources like ours can be accounted for by lack of education. It will be equally impossible to convince ourselves that any increase of schools and schoolmasters will remedy that evil which is driving the very choice of our productive strength from our shores into a forced exile.

CHAPTER X.

DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH.

As we glance at the several resources of the United Kingdom, we are constrained to ask, how it really is that a great portion of the people are in helpless poverty, and so large a portion of them compelled to leave their native land? We approach the answer to these questions when we begin to inquire as to the distribution of property. In Frederick Martin's Year Book for Statesmen,* issued on the 1st of January, 1870, we find an estimate of the three classes into which the community are divided in this country. The "upper class," or "owners of property and their families," are stated at 1,000,000. The "middle class"—"traders and brain-workers"—are stated at 6,000,000. The "lower," or "manual labourers," are 23,000,000. We are disposed to regard this estimate of what is strictly called the "upper class" (that is, of those who have property or income of sufficient amount to raise them above labour with either brain or hand), as a good way above the truth. The number of those who paid income tax on incomes at and above £400 a year from "trades and professions," was 48,735 in 1867. Those deriving above £400 a year from public

* *The Statesman's Year Book*, 1870.

offices, &c., was 10,400. Those having income derived from the public funds were only 4,014, including all entitled to sums above £300. Taking all these put together, we have only 63,149. The entire "landholder" class is only 42,153. From this it would be necessary to deduct a great deal more than two-thirds, in view of holders of quantities of land far too small to place them among the "upper class;" but even if we were to include them all, it would give us an aggregate of 105,302 only. If each of these represented a family of five, it would be but 526,510 persons, instead of a million. In the matter of income tax, 67 persons were charged on an aggregate income of £5,860,321. There were 852 persons charged on £15,181,293. In the matter of "armorial bearings," which are all but universal among the truly "upper class," there were only 57,541 persons charged. In the presence of facts like these, and others that might be added to them, it is very difficult indeed to estimate the truly "upper class" at half a million.

And yet, if we take the estimate of the Year Book, we have £600,000,000 stated as the annual income of the country. £350,000,000 is divided among 7,000,000, and only £250,000,000 among 23,000,000. That gives £100,000,000 more to 7,000,000 souls than is given to 23,000,000. That is £50 a head to the wealthier, and only a fraction above £10, 17s. a head to the poorer. This itself would call for inquiry as to the reason of so

wide a divergence, but it is vastly under the truth as a statement of the real distribution of income. And yet there are far more serious aspects than this of the division of wealth among the people. If this division were near the truth—the result of “fair play,”—and were there no dreadful scourge of poverty threatening the community—driving thousands into exile, and thousands more into a premature grave—it would be a work of supererogation to state the case. But when the statement is far below the truth, and the evil is the result of the foulest play,—as we shall show,—when it is actually depopulating these realms, it is the imperative duty of every man capable of thought to inquire into the causes of the extreme wealth on the one hand, and the extreme poverty on the other.

CHAPTER XI.

EMPLOYMENT OF INCOME.

THERE are instances in which wealth becomes accumulated in the hands of those who employ it for the general good. There are very serious facts which lead us to the conclusion that these instances are too rare. These facts are nowhere more strongly seen than in our foreign trade. Take, for example, that of the United States and France as most striking. In 1868, we imported from the United States no less than £8,892,394, in gold and silver, and we sent out only £112,519. As a contrast to this we sent to France £9,011,394, and brought home only £1,325,487. The balance of trade, so far as gold and silver could show it, was £8,779,875 in our favour with the American States, and £7,685,907 against us with France. How was this? The United States took the produce of our industry to that extent expressed by the sum stated over and above what they sent us chiefly in useful produce for the masses of our people. But the money passed at once into the hands of those to whom France sends her silks and wines, and (over and above the value of a vast amount of goods of a substantial character) it was spent in luxury. Our large export to France might have brought over a vast supply to feed the hungry

and clothe the naked; but the power over it was in hands whose wishes and tastes gave it a different destination. We sent to France, in value, £12,862,668, chiefly useful articles, besides the balance in money we have stated, and we got back, almost exclusively in articles of luxury, £33,033,401. There was no doubt a great profit on the trade, so far as the traders were concerned; but when the wine, brandy, silks, gloves, and similar things are taken into account, we see that there was next to nothing among the entire imports that could reach the hands of the industrial masses of our countrymen. The fruits of their labour brought all—but not for them.

We do not make these statements as if France sent us no good thing, or as if the United States sent us no luxury, but in order to enable the reader to trace the money which comes to us from America and other countries, and goes from us to France, as clearly as anything can be traced, which is laboriously gained by one class, given away to another class, and spent in the luxurious desires of those to whom it is unconsciously conveyed.

But France in this is only one striking instance of a vast system in which a large portion of our own people are devoted to minister to the luxury of those who are unnaturally rich, and who actually think it their duty to keep a large number so devoted. London represents what may well be regarded as a nation within the nation of which it is the capital, and London is nearly entirely given up to the work

of ministering to the luxury of the rich. A portion of those who unfairly derive their wealth from the masses of productive labourers in fruitful parts of this country, go and spend that wealth in France ; but an incalculably greater number go to spend it in the extravagances of the metropolis. Illustrations of this are easily got at on all hands. There, for example, is a small estate in one of our Scottish shires, purchased with the proceeds of a certain trade, or profession, by which its owner has become one of the "upper" class. The farmers and farm-workers on that estate produce what gives, perhaps, two pounds sterling an acre for the landlord. It is the hardest possible grinding for them ; but he lives luxuriously in London, and comes down only to amuse himself in killing the game preserved on the estate for his "sport." The entire produce of that estate, over and above the barest subsistence of the poor people that cultivate it, goes for luxury in that centre of fashion for the United Kingdom. This system makes London one vast sacrifice to the amusement and waste of human life. And that which London is on so vast a scale, other places are on a smaller scale, because of the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, instead of its diffusion among the people as a whole.

If the means of this concentration were fair, we should still deplore the fact, and seek ways and means for its mitigation ; but when the means are unfair in the very last degree—when the effects are

terrible, and increasing in intensity every year, it is the duty of every one to think how so great an evil may be remedied by those unfair means being suppressed. The process now going on would soon ruin any nation. We believe such a process impossible without a departure from social law of the most vital character; but it is useless to speculate on the possible, when that which is actual is perfectly patent to all who will give it serious heed. The vast sum of income now devoted to ruinous luxury, is to a great extent gathered from the robbery of the masses. We shall yet see this truth placed beyond all doubt.

CHAPTER XII.

DISTRIBUTION OF LAND.

THE number of persons who own the surface of a country, when compared with its entire population, is an important part of the index to its social condition. It is more important than the number who are wealthy apart from their ownership of land. For example, in 1861, the landholders of Ireland numbered only 8,412 persons in a population of 5,798,967—that is, the small number of 8,412 held the power of removal from the surface of the country itself of above 5,000,000 of their fellow-creatures. That is, on an average, one person had this power over nearly 700 other persons. That is, one human being having the power, if he so chooses, to deny space on the earth's surface to about 700 of his fellow-men! This does not put the matter so strongly as it would stand if we had the means of showing in how few hands by far the largest portion of the soil is held.

We have another example in Scotland. The landholders in this country, in 1861, numbered only 1,877 men, and 1,098 women. This was a proportion of 2,975 in a population of 3,062,294. That gives only one landholder to every 1,030 of the population. But this is as nothing when we remem-

ber that about half of the whole kingdom is owned by not more than twelve persons. A very great many who hold the land, possess but a very small portion indeed; and the lands of that class are gradually becoming absorbed by the wealthier, so that things are becoming every year worse and worse. We shall see this in the light of most serious facts when we come to consider the crowding of the people into incredibly small areas from this fatal monopoly in land. As much as £50 a year is now paid by labouring men for an acre of space on which to rear their dwellings!

England was a shade better off in this respect than Ireland and Scotland. She had, in 1861, 15,131 men, and 15,635 women who held her land, in a population of 20,066,224 persons—that is, about one landholder to every 652 other persons. In the concentration of land, however, we believe England is following in the wake of the two sister kingdoms. The men who held to so great an extent their own farms, are fast losing their hold through mortgages and necessitated sales, so that in counties where this class were the strength of society, they are becoming, as landholders, extinct. All that tends in this direction is matter of most serious consideration for the true patriot.

It is not indeed to be concluded that, merely because a man owns a large portion of the soil on which his fellow-creatures live, he will necessarily clear them off the land. But it is certain

that the pecuniary interest and scope for amusement, or even retirement, of the landholder, are antagonistic to the occupation of his land by all but a small number of his fellow-creatures. And as the strong temptations of a luxurious life get hold of him, he will find himself constrained to consult that interest and luxury to the uttermost. Here, we shall say, are four small farms, occupied by four families, in all thirty souls, besides the servants needed to work the farms. One man will manage these four farms better than these four farmers who hold them now. His family is made up of two persons. We have a case in view. He will pay a higher rent than the four men can pay. His occupancy will favour the growth of game. The thirty are cleared off in favour of the two! The landlord "has a right to do what he will with his own;" and so perhaps he has, if it is his own by fair play; but, right or not right, it is a serious thing for the persons he shoves aside, that his own money interest and pleasure may be promoted. It is death itself to a very large proportion of them. This is demonstrated by the low death-rate of the country from which they are driven, as compared with the high death-rate of the crowded city to which such families are generally compelled to betake themselves.

Now that the power of law-making has come into the hands of the masses, it will not cease to be matter of increasing consideration that the land is held in so few hands. It is not necessary, nor is it likely,

that it will suggest "confiscation;" but it will suggest that the land shall be held for the public good, or not held at all. Laws regulating the uses to which the land of the nation shall be devoted are inevitable, and will ere long be passed and executed too. Men who can make and unmake the legislature will not die in favour of deer, merely because it so happens that a selfish hand has the landholder's hold of the soil by technical right. The people of this country need not, and we think they will not, resort to any other means by which to redistribute the surface so that all shall have space enough on which to live, than such as will inevitably follow the suppression of unfair modes of dealing between class and class in the community.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE POSITION OF FARMERS.

WE have seen that, on an average, one person in Ireland has the power to clear 700 other persons from the land—one person in Scotland has the same power over 1,030—and one person in England has that power over 652. That was the state of the case (very nearly) in 1861. How had that power been exercised, so far as we have records of a recent date?

First of all, in “the green isle.” From 1841 to 1861 the small holdings in Ireland decreased from 562,235 to 269,400. That is, something near to 292,835 persons were dispossessed by their landlords in favour of those who chose to rent larger portions of the soil. It would be wrong to think that all these cases were instances of hardship, or that all this vast number were cleared off, inasmuch as, if one man took four or five small holdings, and ceased to be himself a small holder by becoming a larger, it was no hardship to him, nor was he cleared off; but such a change involved, as we know, a vast sum of distress, and the constant presence of something like 30,000 troops to carry it out. If no great system of wrong to the mass of the people of Ireland could be pointed out, and the ownership of the land as it now stands could be thoroughly justified, we might

set down the distress against the people who were cleared off themselves. Between 1841 and 1851 the deaths in Ireland from starvation alone amounted to 21,770. We might call this the result of a famine, coming in the course of Providence; but it would be wicked to do so in full view of a system, by means of which one-fourth of the people in Scotland itself are now kept on the borders of absolute destitution. We shall come to the details of that system by and by. We have to do at present with the actual banishment from the tillage of the soil of a large and most important portion of those who had, hitherto, brought their bread and that of their children from it.

In the case of Scotland we have no such records accessible as we have for Ireland; but when we compare the census of 1851 with that of 1861, there is a decrease in the agricultural part of the population to the extent of 9,594, and that in spite of an increase of 173,552 in the sum of the people. This is small when compared with the vast clearances of Ireland, yet it is a serious consideration when 9,594 souls are swept from the land in ten years by the depopulating system followed now on the part of many lords of the soil. These owners of the surface are clearly both able and willing to say to the tide of human life in this kingdom that, so far as their estates are concerned, it shall roll backward; and this is not a thing to be passed over without earnest consideration by every lover of his kind.

England, being the wealthiest of the three kingdoms—being, in fact, that into which the resources of the rest are carried away, to a great extent—shows a depopulating result most slowly. Yet the agricultural population of England decreased from 1851 to 1861 by the number of 73,699, and that notwithstanding an increase of 2,138,615. It is a curious thing to think of the process by which the great landlords are gradually clearing off the human element from their estates, and crowding the masses closer and closer in the fatal atmosphere of the great towns. It is not in the nature of the case to avoid misery and expatriation if such a process goes on. It is an almost infinite mockery of a people who are being thus cleared off from the face of God's earth, to talk to them of "education," or of any other benefit, while bare foothold on the soil is denied them. The facts of human sacrifice which spring out of this system are truly dreadful: but we must not anticipate.

CHAPTER XIV.

POPULATION OF THE SEABOARD.

WE have stated the area that may be strictly included in the United Kingdom as consisting of 175,000 square miles. In this we have embraced "British waters," as well as land and lakes. Stated in acres, that would be 112,000,000. If we take land with lakes and rivers only, we have 120,879 square miles, or 77,362,560 acres. This is exclusive of the Channel Islands; including these, the acreage is 77,513,585; we allow the difference to go into the seaboard. It will make ample house and garden ground for our seafaring people. This, then, leaves us 54,121 square miles, or 34,637,440 acres on which, by means of fisheries, to gather the food of a fair proportion of the population. It is to be kept in mind that, in such an estimate as we are now contemplating, we must fairly include the fishing-grounds that are within easy reach of our shores, though not strictly British waters. For example, a map of British fisheries, like that prefixed to the Royal Commissioners' Report of 1866, includes the Doggar Bank, lying off the coast opposite Hull. French and other fishermen have as good a right to fish over this ground as British, yet it is accessible easily to our fishermen, and vastly productive. So

are similar grounds at other parts off our coasts. But we give our own waters only as included in our estimate of surface available for life to a British people, that we may keep within the mark, and run no risk of going beyond it.

If, then, we assign the fair proportion of our present population to this amount of seaboard, how will they stand? We have, in round numbers, 30,000,000 on 175,000 square miles—that is, fully 172 persons to the square mile. It is thirty millions to one hundred and twelve millions of acres—that is, above three acres and two-thirds for every human being in these lands. The dry land, as we have said, with inland lakes and rivers, amounts to 120,879 square miles, leaving 54,121 as the full extent of the seaboard, or British waters. Say, now, that we give 172 persons to the square mile of seaboard, that is only 9,308,812 persons as the fair proportion for our seafarers. We mean by this, that if the acreage of “British waters” and the seashore are no more crowded than British land as a whole, there will be 9,308,812 persons dependent on the produce of these waters.

Well, let us take one or two facts that bear upon this view of our people. “The total weight of fish landed at Hull, in 1854, was 1,571 tons. In 1864, it had increased to 10,782 tons.” At Grimsby, by similar increase, in 1864, it was 11,108 tons. At Yarmouth, in 1864 also, it was 34,432 tons. At Lowestoft it was 17,340 tons. There was a fishing

amounting to 73,752 tons of wholesome food brought into four ports of England in one year.

How many men of twenty years of age and upwards were employed in this fishing? To answer this question we take the whole number entered as "fishermen," in 1861, residing in the whole of the East Riding of Yorkshire, Lincoln, and Norfolk—that is, on the whole coast of which the four ports mentioned are representatives. The number was only 2,147. If we multiply that by five, thus giving five to a family, it amounts to only 10,735 souls. The amount of fish landed at these four ports alone would give nearly seven tons a year to every person in the population engaged in the fisheries and dependent on them. When we consider, in this connection, the rapid increase in the produce of these fisheries evident from the fact already stated, and the almost unlimited capability of yield in the ocean, it seems immeasurably absurd to think of an overcrowded population on our shores. If 10,735 people are equal to bringing 73,252 tons of fish from the sea in one year, what would 9,308,812 people do? They would land above 50,000,000 tons. Nor do we in this take a peculiarly favourable instance in illustration of our point.

The statistics of the Scotch herring fisheries are of an equally striking character. In the five years ending with 1864, 3,372,000 barrels of herrings were *cured* in these fisheries. They were worth from 26s. to 40s. a barrel—say 30s. on the average. This vast

sum was in addition to an untold number of this fish that were sold uncured, yet it represents an earning of £5,058,000 in this fishery alone. This would give above £55 to every man, woman, boy, and girl employed in the work. Keep in mind that this was but a part of the actual gain. Any one who has lived near even a small fishing station, and seen the fishermen coming in from the sea in the morning, while a host of carts were waiting for their freight, ready to run off laden to neighbouring towns to sell the uncured fish; and still more, one who has seen, at such a port as that of Scarborough, from 700 to 800 tons sent by railway into the country in a single day, cannot but know that the food, and all required for many times the population we have assigned to the seaboard as its proportion, is already brought from it to the land. If nine millions were placed on the seashore, instead of the small number now upon our fishing-stations, the seaboard would not be half occupied; yet that number would take its full proportion as we now stand. How vastly must men be misled who talk of too many people being in this country!

Two things alone limit the possible numbers of our fishing population—the one is the denial of space on shore on which to live, the other is the swindling from them of their earnings. On many hundreds of miles of the coast no fisherman is allowed to place his cabin, or to lay up his boat. - Wherever a few fishing families are allowed to live, as a rule, a place

for the sale of liquor and tobacco is licensed; and their scanty store is kept at its scanty rate by their paying eighteenpence, or even two shillings, for a pennyworth of liquor, and a shilling for the same value in tobacco. Poor boats, poor nets, poor everything belonging to the fisherman, is the result. But it is fearfully wicked, in the face of the facts of the case, to speak of overcrowding, and to ship off our people as if the land were full. We can give but a glance at the vast resources of the waters that thus teem with life and food for men; but even that glance will, we trust, rouse many to earnest thought on the true and terrible state of the case of our country.

CHAPTER XV.

POPULATION ON FRESH WATERS.

NEXT to those who live by the produce of the sea, comes that portion of a population who live by the water-power of our lakes and rivers. We have seen, so far, how abundantly the square miles of salt water may be utilized for subsistence to a population many times the number of that portion requiring to be assigned to it in our present state of things. In the same light, it is easy to see how the deduction made for lakes and rivers from the total acreage, is fairly included among the resources found on the surface of our country. Lakes are the natural reservoirs of water-power, rivers are the natural mill-races along which that power is conveyed for the use of man. This is apart from that use of them to which we have already alluded, in which they supply our large cities with water. It is apart, also, from their use as highways for internal communication of great importance. Water-power is a great positive force, by the mere acceptance of which many thousands of our people are already producing goods of value to a very high measure.

If we take as instances the cotton-mills on the Clyde, and on the other rivers of the west of Scot-

land, with the other manufactories in various other districts producing other descriptions of goods, we have illustrations of this truth as to water-power. If we include the water-power of England and Wales, and even of Ireland, we find that the part of the population already depending on this source of life is very considerable; and if we but glance at the vast extent to which that power is available beyond that degree in which it is used now, we shall see no reason to make deductions from our total area on account of lakes and rivers. The citizens of Edinburgh, for example, lately took up the idea of having their supply of water from St. Mary's Loch, in Peeblesshire. Instantly the millowners along the course of the rivers depending for water-power on the supply in the loch, made it apparent that no small sum would suffice as "compensation" for even the partial diversion of water from their wheels. The same thing was made evident, to the no small cost of the citizens of Glasgow, when they applied for a very few feet of the surface of Loch Katrine. Such is the value of that water which is now flowing from our great lake reservoirs. The water-power used in textile factories, in 1868, amounted to that of 29,830 horses; yet this does not nearly include the water-power actually used in the United Kingdom, which is made to work in so many ways besides that of spinning and weaving. And it is capable of being used to tenfold the degree to which it is used now. Wheels sufficiently large and numerous to

receive the fall of our rivers, so that all our water-power should be employed in actual production, would, without doubt, far more than increase ten-fold the rate at which that power is made use of at our present stage. The number of acres deducted on account of lakes and rivers is, in Scotland alone, 152,967. The number in England and Ireland is not estimated with any degree of exactness, so far as we find; but it cannot, in either, be above the sum of Scotland. It must be greatly under that sum; but it will be going on the safe side to regard it as the same. If we put the three kingdoms on an equal footing in this respect, the result would be about 716 square miles as the fresh water area. That would call for a population of only 68,752. This would include boatmen and all dependent for a living on our fresh water system. There is now, as we have seen, a water-power actually used to the extent of 29,830 horses, which would be at the disposal of about a third of the above number of people as their working population. Allowing for children and others, not workers, there would be nearly the power of three horses for every two persons capable of attending to it. There lies too, beyond the limit of present use, as we have seen, a vast sum of power available for a great deal more than ten times the above numbers. This could readily and easily be employed in the sustenance of a large and prosperous population. From the single family now occupying

a small meal mill, and paying a high rent for their water-power alone, to the large millowner, or company of millowners, who are making fortunes from the use of that same power, we have abundant illustrations of this deeply interesting part of our great subject. Putting the fisheries on the seaboard and the water-power of our fresh water lakes and rivers together, we have far more than enough for the comfortable supply of their proportion of our present people. That is, altogether, 9,377,564, of all ages. We shall by and by see how this estimate tells on the actual state of things, and the question will be terribly answered why so many of our people are perishing for want, and so many thousands being shipped off to distant shores.

CHAPTER XVI.

UNPRODUCTIVE SURFACE.

IT would require a very great deal of calculation to tell exactly how much of the surface of this country is actually unproductive, and to assign its proportion of population to specially productive portions,—the ground, for example, on which a house or a factory is built, that on which an ironwork is erected, that which is covered by mountains of debris from mines, or otherwise used for productive purposes, could not be included in an estimate of waste land. The ground occupied by the railways and highways of the kingdom is not unproductive. Putting our whole agricultural and pastoral area together, we have a little over 70,881 square miles. If we add only 4,500 to this sum as representative of all occupied in the ways we have just indicated, we must deduct 75,381 from 120,163, in order to find in the difference, which is 44,782 square miles, something like the extent of our “mountain and heath” which are now unproductive. For this we should have a population of 7,701,504. To him who scarcely can be said to think at all, or to him who thinks only on the mere fancies of things as they present themselves to his own prejudiced mind, it would probably seem absurd in the extreme to

speaking of finding sustenance and homes, for above seven millions of a population, on our heaths and mountains. But it will seem very different indeed to him who has looked about him thoughtfully during even a brief sojourn in the Highlands, where such land abounds. It has to be kept in mind that at the rate of population on which we are proceeding, every family of five persons would have 18 acres of surface. In illustration of what we mean, take Sutherland, which had at last census only 13 persons on the square mile: allow these to have as their own what they occupy now, with power to subdue the whole of the square mile on which they live, and ere long they would not find it hard to sustain even 172. What is it which prevents the industrious and frugal mountaineer from really thriving—subduing the heath and covering the mountain with good flocks? It is all summed up in one word, and that word is “rent.” This means that the produce which would suffice for all his wants, and those of all properly depending upon him, must, in the great sum of it, go to another class of men. We shall abundantly explain how this difficulty is brought to stand in the way of the increase of our Highland populations, and how it is wasting them rapidly away: but this is not yet the place for such an explanation. We must first make the facts as to the capabilities of the land clear, and then give the explanation of the present state of things. But no one who knows anything

on the subject can doubt that if our Highland peasantry *owned* the heaths and mountains on which they live, they would soon be tenfold the number they are now.

There are two representatives of property on our heaths and highest mountains, — the one is the “*factor*,” the other is the “*gamekeeper*.” These represent “*rent*.” The factor takes care to gather the last farthing that can be raised, through the sportsman and the farmer, for the heath and the mountain; and he raises all the more that the gamekeeper does his best to have the game as numerous as possible. Between these two representatives of ownership the farmer becomes so hard pressed that, were it not for a strong clinging to the land of his fathers’ sepulchres, he would not long be found on this side of the Atlantic. This is not from any evil in the principle of property, and could not be cured by confiscation, nor yet by communism. The evil is in the principle by which property is taken from the right hands of the many and concentrated in those of the very few. We have no idea of arguing that seven millions of souls might live in comfort where now we have only heath and mountain all but void of population, under the present system; but that system is just the very evil which we see the great legislator of the Hebrews anticipating and preventing when he foresaw that men would add field to field till they dwelt all but alone in the earth, and appointed the restorations of the jubilee.

It is on the principle that the men who till the land shall own it also, that we can alone see what a country is capable of sustaining: and it is no unheard-of theory that they should so own it. Our present great "land question," as it affects Ireland, is proceeding on the idea that tillage of land gives at least a full right to that difference in value which lies between its untilled and tilled condition to him who tills it. He does not see far who does not anticipate the day when it will be well executed British law that no snare shall be laid, such as entraps the proprietor of a few acres into handing over his right to his richer superior; and, moreover, that all land shall be held for the public good, and so shall not be held by him who devotes it to his own private whims; and when that shall be, there will be scope enough on our moors and mountains for far more than seven millions of a thriving population. Let any one examine a community of those who in some parts of Scotland are called "*moss lairds*,"—that is, men to whom a certain portion of utterly useless land (lying under a depth of peat, growing heath only) is given for a series of years without rent, on condition that they clear and render it fit for cropping. We do not know a more interesting set of families than these always are. A lazy man cannot be among them, nor a drunken man—all must be industrious; and the more children they have the better, these are very soon indeed worth their keep to their fathers. Had these

people the power to buy and keep their little cleared patches, while generation after generation went on clearing for themselves, and owning also, we should very soon have far more than seven millions occupying what is now only "heath and mountain land." But there is a system by means of which they are effectually prevented from being able to do this. If one generation is allowed to go to the grave without being subjected to the temptations of the drink curse, the following is not allowed to do so. One successful brewer is able to buy out a thousand of them for the sake of a few weeks' sport in autumn. So is any one into whose hands the taxation of liquordom is directed and remains. The beggared remnants of our peasantry are consequently driven off everywhere towards, or into, the huge masses now concentrated in the fatal atmosphere of the great towns, and our heaths and mountain-land are given up to something nearly as bad as desolation.

CHAPTER XVII.

A GRAZING POPULATION.

WE have now disposed of by far the most difficult portions of our country's surface, and shown, we think, their full capability to sustain their share of the people who inhabit the United Kingdom. The next part of the land to which we must direct attention is "permanent pasture, meadow, or grass *not broken up in rotation.*" Though not exclusively pasture land,—inasmuch as parts of it belong to farms of an arable character, and are used for hay,—on the whole, the sum of it represents our grazing space and resources. Here we have to do with about 34,632 square miles, or 22,164,584 acres of grass land, and the proportion of the population is 5,956,704. As this land is now used, there could be no difficulty in the sustenance of a much larger number if the flocks were their own and fed on their own pasture.

Chiefly on this land there grazed, in 1868, no less than 35,607,812 sheep, besides no small proportion of 9,183,416 cattle. It is interesting to look over the tables and see how the proportions lay. For example, on every 100 acres of Aberdeenshire there were 28 cattle and 29 sheep, while on the same breadth in Argyle there were 45 cattle and 786

sheep; in Selkirk, 11 cattle and 818 sheep, omitting the fractions. This tells us what is meant by permanent pasture or grass land. These flocks and herds are cultivated now on a system which implies the smallest possible number of people on the land where they are fed. It is not food and clothing for those who actually cultivate the flocks but *rent* that is the great thing aimed at, and hence the system is pursued that will bring the greatest amount of this. There are few, if any, more noble men than our shepherds as a class; but what would they be in position and number if they owned the flocks they feed and the land on which they feed them? To what extent could they retain their sons and daughters in their homes, instead of sending them off to do domestic work to other men, if this were the case? We must not allow selfish and foolish prejudice to turn away our thoughts from such questions if we would really study the capabilities of our native land.

But this introduces another and most important element into this part of our subject. A vast amount of the land now permanently under grass is capable of cultivation such as would far more than treble its grazing power, and a great deal of it is capable of good corn culture. This is true of a vast portion of it now given up to deer. Hundreds of thousands of sheep are cleared off for the sake of "sport," and that not from the worst of land. But apart from this sad fact, the surface now keeping

sheep only could be well and profitably cultivated for grain. Where there is an enterprising family, having good advantages—such as low rent, or similar encouragement—you can see the truth of this in the beautiful green of certain fields, and in the yellow grain in harvest time, where all was, not long ago, a gray pasture, or even brown heath. Where the liquor curse has been kept at a distance, this is the state of things, even under great disadvantages otherwise; showing us what would be the case if our pastoral population were so raised as to be owners of the acres on which they now feed the cattle and sheep of other men.

No doubt the bare suggestion of such a state of things will seem like sedition to those who worship great wealth, whether as its owners, or as those who adore it even in others' hands. But if it is determined that millions shall be denied even a footing on God's earth in order that a few persons should wallow in riches, it should be understood on all hands that *this* is the cause of the poverty and the exile of those millions, and not that they are starved and banished because the Father of all has failed to make room for them. If, for example, twelve men shall own the half of all Scotland, as the favoured beings to whom that Great Father has given it, in order that they may drive off from its surface all but the few suited to serve their luxurious purposes; and if it is in Providence that masses should be heaped tier above tier as they now lie in our great

cities, dying in scores every week for want of food and air, it should be very plainly preached that this is the normal state of things. If the cattle on a thousand hills are either not God's, or being His He wills that they should be used for only a small favoured portion of the human family, the less favoured should understand this. They should not have the straitness of the land for them put forward as a reason for that which is to be accounted for altogether otherwise.

But we cannot help digressing so far as to say that there are symptoms, and very strong symptoms too, which tend to show that a spirit is awakening which will not long allow the truth and justice of this vast subject to lie hid. In the very last election of members to represent us in Parliament, the greatest of our landholders saw their sons set aside by the populations of the lands they own. The farming class are awaking out of the sleep of centuries, and the class below that are not destined to lie long in slumber. Emigration, though it will save a few thousand families from the horrors of our social state, is absolutely powerless to right that state as it now proceeds from year to year. Nay, emigration is calculated to put that state further away, as we shall yet show. The cry will go up into ears that will not be allowed the privilege of deafness; and those who now bid defiance to the tide of life, and compel it to roll backward, will see it their wisdom to yield and allow the pastures of our

country to be again trod by the feet of noble men, who shall own both their lands and the flocks that are fed upon them. This will not be by "confiscation," nor yet by charity; but by the culture of a virtuous and frugal character, where now the plunder of the drink-shop is gathered amid the sins and sorrows of a degraded people. The first right step in legislation has been already taken in this direction in the case of Ireland. There the farmers are now not only to be protected in their interests, so far as improvement of the land is concerned, but helped by loans from the public purse in purchasing the lands which they improve. The idea at the root of Mr. Gladstone's great land bill for the Green Isle is, that of the men who farm acres owning them also. Another mighty step is required, and it too will be taken ere long.

CHAPTER XVIII.

OUR AGRICULTURAL POPULATION.

THE part of our country to which we naturally come after that which is strictly pastoral, is that usually described in authoritative statistics as "under all kinds of crops, bare fallow, and grass." The grasses meant in this heading are, "clover, and artificial and other grasses under rotation." The land so described is strictly that which is coming regularly under the plough. It is such as for its present culture demands a considerable population, just as that kept under permanent pasture or meadow land requires comparatively few. Its extent is a little over 36,249 square miles, or 23,199,476 acres. The population belonging to it, if no more were given than to the rest of the space we include in the United Kingdom, would be only 6,134,828.

There are several ways in which we may estimate the capability of the land in relation to such a people. The rent alone will average £2 an acre. Some of our richest land, where it is well situated, pays as high as £5, and no arable land really under crops pays less than £1. A rent of £2 an acre would be under, rather than over, the mark. This, then, is the yield of the land after all expense of tillage is defrayed, together with the profits of the

farmer. These, alas! are low, from the state of things prevailing; still they are something, and not to be altogether despised. If, then, we calculate the rent of the acres before us at £2, that is a yearly sum of £46,372,752. That is, about £7, 10s. for every soul in the population assigned to this land. It is £37, 10s. for every family of five, and that in rent alone. If you add to this the value of the labour of which such a population are capable, and by which the yield of the land could easily be vastly increased, it will appear cogently that our arable land is sufficient not only for the sustenance of such a people, but for that number in addition to all that occupy it now. How is it, then, that men cry out for the shipment of 100,000 souls annually, as essential to the deliverance of the country? We shall by and by show how it is. The explanation is only too close at hand.

There is another way, besides that of rent, in which this capability of the land is seen. There is nothing more striking than the stream of produce now flowing from all our agricultural and pastoral districts up to London. Less striking, but not less instructive, are the small streams that flow in the direction of other great cities. The distance over which this produce is sent is astonishing. The consequent enhancement of its money value is very great. The profits of merchants, and the cost of conveyance, is something enormous. All this is so much less to the general population. Consumed on

or near the land on which it is produced, all this cost of exchange on this produce would be saved. Why is it that a country cries out reasonably, and fiercely, against "*absenteeism*" on the part of its proprietors? It is not merely because these do not spend their rents at home, but because these rents, in produce, must go to where they live, to feed them and those they employ in the most costly way, instead of remaining to feed, comparatively inexpensively, the people who produce it. The cost of exchange and conveyance, as this country now stands in this very matter, enriches thousands and would sustain millions. Men must ere long open their eyes to this—emigration will not serve to hide it.

From the pastoral being mixed up with the strictly agricultural population in all our returns, it is not easy to say how many at present really live by agriculture. The sum is greatest, no doubt, in England; but the proportion is far the greatest in Ireland, where a large portion of the whole people are still on the land. The number is remarkably small in Scotland. But, whether we take one country or another, it is beyond doubt that the soil is capable of sustaining a great increase beyond its present occupants,—and that, too, altogether apart from the important matter of manufacture for other countries. The land is not able to support other lands as it is now doing. Millions of acres in France are given up to raise wine for the rich in this country. British labour must make up for this, and keep the

French whose labour and land are so employed. So with vast tracts of country elsewhere than in France. Directly or indirectly, the produce of our fields is sent off to compensate the countries from which the costly extravagances of wealth are drawn for the few. We are not able for this and the sustenance of a population such as the country can well enough sustain of itself. Neither are we able to sustain the fearful waste of good food in the manufacture of liquor, now consuming what we shall soon see is an incredible sum. These things must be laid to heart, for (as we have said more than once) emigration cannot help us out of the difficulty which these bring, and must keep upon us, so long as the present system goes on. The cause must be arrested, or the effect will continue to grow upon us. As we shall more fully show, when we come properly to the point, the men who emigrate are the very hands by whose industry we have been kept so long from the state of collapse which has at length come. The men and women they leave behind are the comparatively helpless, whose energy is not even sufficient to stave off pauperism from themselves, and who cannot possibly wage a successful war with a system which drains off every possible penny, and thing, to be devoured in luxury. Another system than that which now prevails must come, and it will come; it is, in fact, coming fast.

CHAPTER XIX.

WHERE ARE THE PEOPLE ?

WE have now gone over the whole of our surface, with the exception of 4,500 square miles allowed for dwelling and working space, not otherwise productive. We have, so to speak, allocated and provided for all but 829,400 of the people taken at thirty millions. This number is made up of 774,000 belonging to the ground space with which we have now to do, and of 55,400 belonging to fractional parts of other land, omitted in our rough calculations. If the population were fairly distributed as land and water allow, at no greater density than 172 persons to the square mile, there would be left only 774,000 for all our cities, towns, and villages, of every size and character. He who takes a careful view of the country with its capabilities, will see that but for a fatal system of distribution on the surface, there could be no such thing possible as an overcrowded community on that surface. He will, in his mind's eye, see a people fully capable, not only of providing for themselves, from sea and land, but for twice their number; and so situated that all have full space on which to dwell, and in which to breathe the breath of life. He will be naturally

interested in the question as to where this people are now. And when he sees where they are, he will be still more interested in the question as to why they are so frightfully concentrated in our cities and large towns.

As we have traced the capabilities of the country from the circumference towards the centres, we may look here first to the fishermen. These we find in crowds and poverty as a great general rule. Instead of having vessels capable of living in a storm, and harbours adequate to such vessels, with all needed space for comfortable and healthful dwellings, they go to sea in boats utterly inadequate for their working and safety, and come home to houses of the poorest character. Is this because they do not win a sufficient amount of money to enable them to accumulate capital for their purpose? No. It is because the money they win goes from them in the most heartrending of all ways, at the rate of two shillings often for a penny-worth of liquor, such as unfits them both for their hazardous work, and also for their knowing their own true interests. The fishermen who bring their fish into the port of London, actually sell that for 3d. to 4d. "which is charged 1s., 1s. 3d., and 1s. 6d. a pound" by the retailer.* This is in keeping with the fishermen purchasing from the licensed liquor sellers for a shilling, one-and-sixpence, and even two shillings, that which is worth, at the brewery

**Fisheries Report, 1866, page xvii.*

and distillery, only a penny! Wherever this liquor traffic is absent, our fishermen are among the most prosperous of our people, and are able to sell their goods to full advantage. They are able, too, to have houses worthy of prosperity.

But we soon find more sad food for reflection. How about that part of the people who live by water-power? Go to such a place as New Lanark, where Robert Owen built what he, poor man, thought a model village. There you see a poor crowd of souls condemned to stand on the mill floors from early morning till night, and then to sleep where, instead of 172 to a square mile, you have some thousands cooped up within a very few acres! The very faces of the people tell you of a low vitality, the result of overwork and want of sufficient food and air. There are contrasts to this. At Catrine, in Ayrshire, for example, you have a people more liberally dealt with as to space, and hence a healthy people comparatively, yet a people kept down, on the whole, by the way in which they are dealt with in the infamous liquor trade; a people, too, who suffer terribly, because of the competition unnaturally forced upon them through the driving off from pastoral and arable land of those who, when driven off, sell work and life in our mills. Masses who ought to be tilling the fields of Ireland, or tending their own flocks in the Highlands, are condemned to imprisonment with hard labour for life to our cotton factories. Just before us (in this

morning's paper as we write) is the statement that in one instance "twenty small tenants, with their belongings, were cleared off for the sake of deer." What then? Where are these twenty families to go? To a manufacturing town. What then? Is not that at least a hundred pairs of hands going to compete with those already far too many there, for leave to toil and herd in the crowded houserom?

What are we to say about our unproductive heaths and mountains? Where are the 7,701,504 who ought by this time in the history of civilization to have been nearly finishing the subjugation of our waste acres? They have not only not been permitted to encroach upon these, but have been, and are being driven away from the borders from which they might successfully assail them. Even if they could compete with English sportsmen in paying more rent than these gentlemen could afford, for the privilege of cultivating the ground, it is doubtful if they would be allowed in the present temper of those who claim the land; but they have no power of the kind. Whisky has cursed and beggared our Highlands. As much of it is drunk, and paid for at the rate of two shillings for a pennyworth, on the occasion of a single funeral, as would account for a whole family's savings for years. The mass of the people are consequently helpless, and are swept away, as in the above-mentioned case, by twenty families at a stroke, till the land that they had reclaimed is becoming waste again.

The truth of this is seen when we come to the pastoral population. Where are they? It is chiefly from among them that the hands should be found to reclaim our larger wastes, so as to make them pastoral at least. In Scotland, especially, it is amazing to how great an extent the land is bare of inhabitants. We have already alluded to Sutherland, with its thirteen and three-tenths to the square mile. We have also Inverness, with only twenty and eight-tenths, Argyle with only twenty-four and a-half, Ross and Cromarty with only twenty-five and eight-tenths, and Peebles with only thirty-two. Place their proper proportion of 172 to the square mile on these counties (and they are abundantly fit to sustain them), what would be the result? Instead of people crowding each other to death in our over-full towns and cities, and making good wages impossible, we should have room and to spare, and manufacturing labour would be worth three times what it will bring now. Our working men do not see what is wrong. They imagine that if they get wages forced up, all will be well! If they can only drive off apprentices, and all other competitors, so as to keep the supply of labour down, they must prosper! How little they calculate on the crowds that are gathering around all centres of work, who must be fed or die, and who will force themselves, one way or other, upon the labour-market, do what workmen may, so long as they are driven off the land.

The same truth stares us in the face when we come to the arable land and its population. As we have already seen, a larger proportion of people is absolutely necessary here, if the land is to be properly wrought; but it is not necessary that these should be other than mere labourers, who shall be utterly dependent on a few masters. So the small farmer gives way to the mere ploughman; and capitalists, few in number, command the soil. This gives rise to a very remarkable state of things. The Irish farmers, with their families, are driven off from their farms, and come over to Scotland in shoals to press their labour on our capitalist farmers. They are fast taking the place of a Scotch peasantry, while these are driven into the towns, or altogether off the country. Again, our Scotchmen are crowding in upon English labour and competing with that, both in the country and in the towns. The Irish are cheaper than the Scotch, and the Scotch are cheaper than the English; and, without knowing why, the working masses are being shoved off in thousands to save them from death, only because there is a horribly false system operating upon the more distant portions of the people.

Hence, while the whole population left for all our cities, towns, and villages put together, if we allow its fair share to every class, would be under one million, London alone has far above two millions of inhabitants. Our people are to be found cooped up and laid one above another, in what are called the

“great centres,” in a manner that is more than enough to rouse every earnest soul to its utmost pitch of enthusiasm in seeking out the real cause, and the true remedy, for such a dreadful state of things.

But we must pursue this subject under the aspect of its consequences, and in another chapter. It is when seen in these consequences that the clearance of our square miles of land is beheld in its truly terrible character; and it is here also that the system by which the masses are rendered helpless has the evidence of its sad character. While many are shocked at the mere immorality of drunkenness, the far more fatal power of avarice, acting through means of the fascinating power of liquor, is devouring thousands of precious lives.

CHAPTER XX.

CROWDING AND DEATH.

SILLY men, when we urge a subject like this upon them, are satisfied to grumble because we are "trying to set class against class," or with some equally foolish expression of their dissatisfaction. They seem to imagine that it is the God-appointed state of things that now prevails! But men and women of thought will follow out the subject, and not rest till they see its end. You must come, then, with us into such a city as Edinburgh, or Glasgow. We may look into both. In these cities you find as many as from 400 to upwards of 600 sleeping, all at once, over one acre of space on the earth's surface. That is, at the rate of 246,000 or 384,000 to the square mile instead of 172. By an infamous system, which is only too easily explained, masses are unable even to rent enough of ground on which to place a bed. We have the most striking illustrations of the results of this in our large Scottish towns—notably we have these in its metropolis. The excellent Officer of Health in Edinburgh, Dr. Littlejohn, has furnished admirable information on this, and, indeed, on all points bearing on the sanitary condition of the people. Let us look up one of these seven or eight storey "*lands*,"

as they are called, so common in Edinburgh, with from 150 to 200 persons living in each flat. Tier above tier, these poor people sleep one over the other, so that if it were not for the floors there would be literally no room for half the beds on that portion of surface on which the house stands. These people are actually denied space on the surface of the earth on which to sleep, and are compelled to pile themselves thus one above the other in the air. Here is an instance to the point furnished by Dr. Littlejohn. It is "No. 23 St. James' Street." There are six flats and 220 souls in that one house; no less than ten families, numbering 49 persons, occupy the first floor. They have only 13 rooms among the 49, and we may form some idea of how many must sleep in each very small room. The second flat has nine families, but 54 persons. So we rise, flat after flat, till we have the whole 220 human beings accommodated. The flat actually on the surface of the earth is devoted to shops—the house is really seven storeys high. The whole 220 persons in this one building are without a foot of the actual surface of the land on which to exist. In 1863 the deaths in this "land," as it is called, were six. That is, a death-rate of over 27 in the thousand, and this in spite of the utmost efforts to keep the mortality down. Dr. Littlejohn says that cases of infectious disease occurring in such houses are speedily carried off to the Infirmary; and that were not this the case the mortality would be "greatly increased." As it is,

that mortality is vastly above what it is where men live on the ground, and have air to breathe. Dr. Littlejohn shows that in one district—that is, “Between the North Bridge and St. Mary’s Wynd,”—the people are heaped above one another, till as many as 646 live over a square acre of surface! The mortality here is enormous, and is explained by the density of the population,—that is, by the simple fact that they are laid thus above one another. With all the efforts to keep it down it is above 39 in the thousand annually.

One dreadfully affecting fact comes out here in connection with children under five years of age. The death rate annually among the young below this age is above 184 in the thousand; that is, out of every one thousand of such infants denied sufficient breath for want of space to live in, above 184 die in the course of the year! It is in the tender bud that the vast majority are slain by this Moloch of iniquity. When we take the two extremes in Edinburgh,—the death rate of the Grange district, we have only thirteen in the thousand, while in the worst part of the city it is above sixty—it shows us that 47 persons out of every thousand are hurried prematurely into eternity every year, in these horrid throngs, by overcrowding alone; but when we look at the proportion of children’s deaths to the number of their class, the sacrifice is more dreadful still.

Dr. Gairdner has issued a deeply interesting

report of the health of Glasgow during the trying months in the spring of 1869. From that we learn that, in five districts, with about 80,000 inhabitants favourably situated, the death rate rose 12 in the thousand above the usual low average; but in thirteen districts, with about the same population unfavourably placed, it rose no less than 26 above the usually high average. This shows us that in the special times when death strikes a city with unusual rigour, the poor crowded masses feel by far the keenest sweep of the scourge. All combines to cry aloud for space on the old earth's bosom on which her children may breathe.

Now, let us not be misunderstood. This placing of human beings over one another, causing so high a death rate, is not the case with the poor and vicious alone. It is just as bad with the most respectable of the working classes, and even with many above them in social rank. An unnatural value has been given to the surface, so that it is utterly impossible for the majority of the people to pay for as much of it as is needful for bare life to themselves and their children, and so they must make up their minds to live above one another in this way, with the perfect assurance that a large proportion of them will die prematurely as the consequence. Dr. Littlejohn says—"The inhabitants most comfortably housed are to be found in India Place and Dean Street, but, notwithstanding these advantages, the closeness with which the people are packed leads to un-

healthiness, and raises the mortality. It has been plausibly urged that this high rate of mortality is caused by their proximity to the water of Leith; but this explanation is seen to be erroneous when the sanitary condition of the village of the Water of Leith is enquired into." There, as the Dr. shows, the sanitary conditions are vastly worse, with the exception that the poor people live on the ground, and do not sleep one tier above another in the air. It is just as certain as any truth can possibly be, *that for want of land* a large proportion of the people of this country are thus killed off every year. They are denied this absolutely essential condition of bare life. No doubt they are denied other conditions, such as sufficient food and clothing, together with other advantages tending to health; but in this one matter of mere surface alone, we have the explanation of the premature death of many many thousands annually.

CHAPTER XXI.

LAND AND LIQUOR.

IF a man has a shilling and gives it for drink, he cannot have that shilling with which to do anything else. If a people give up an acre of land for the growth of grain to be consumed in making drink, they cannot have that land for any other purpose, any more than the man can have his shilling. There is nothing more certain than this. A man, for example, lives now in a £10 house, but he gives away so much for liquor this year, that he moves into one at £5. He goes on, and the third year he rents a cellar at £2, 10s. This is a case of which we know the details. It is illustrative of the way in which we are giving up the land year by year, till the masses are dying for utter lack of fresh air. Let us look a little at the details of this dreadful element in explanation of our overcrowding and mortality.

The grain and sugar used in the manufacture of strong drink in the United Kingdom, in 1868, was equal to 60,000,000 bushels of barley. At 40 bushels to the acre, that is equal to 1,500,000 acres of good land. That would give a quarter of an acre of land to every family of four in the entire population. On that land, capable of giving house and

garden room to the entire people, there was not allowed one bed to be laid, because of the use made of it for this vile end! Not one particle of good (but a vast sum of evil) sprang out of this tremendous sacrifice of land. Nothing such as could compensate society in the slightest degree was allowed for it. Let any sane man, who is not cursed by avarice and interested in the prey, ask himself the question if any country can give up so much of its best surface to such a purpose, and still its people have room on that surface to breathe?

Then the ground is not only lost, but the food raised upon it is lost also. The whole land in Scotland returned as under corn crops, in 1868, was only 1,386,441 acres. The land given up in that year to the growth of grain for liquor was greatly above that under these crops in the whole of this northern kingdom. All the best land actually under corn crops, with all their produce, represent so much land occupied and so much land lost—and worse than lost—to the masses of the United Kingdom. If there were nothing but this, would it not account for our overcrowding and death?

Then, for what purpose really is that land given up, and that food all wasted? We sometimes wonder if any one is so foolish as to imagine that it is so devoted from the highly benevolent wish that "the working man should not be deprived of his beer." We wonder if our Home Secretary is so absolutely childish as to fancy that it is "justice"

to the masses of the people to keep the power of suppressing the liquor traffic out of their hands. He said, in the House of Commons, on the 12th of May last, that it would be an "injustice" so to commit this traffic to the votes of two-thirds of the ratepayers. It is difficult—most difficult—to believe that a man with brain enough to be Home Secretary for the Empire, could be so utterly silly as to believe such a monstrous absurdity. That grain is used for the very same purpose as that for which opium is grown in India. The opium has an irresistible fascination in relation to the Chinese—so has alcoholic liquor in relation to the masses of this country. Men and women will part with all but life to get it, and if it could be enjoyed without life, they would give that too. The grain is used simply in the manufacture of a bait by means of which any amount of money can be drawn from a certain large class in the community. This can scarcely escape any mind that has given the very slightest attention to the subject. It is the grossest foolery that ever was talked when men speak of a certain number of shops for the sale of liquor being "necessary" in a district, unless it is meant "necessary in order to draw the money out of the pockets of the people;" consequently the occupancy of the land, and the waste of grain, are all against the masses, not merely negatively but positively. When this infamous system has gone on increasing till the whole arable area of one of the three kingdoms is devoted to it, is it any

matter for wonder that even 646 persons are found huddled over an acre of surface? The space on the earth is abundantly provided, but it is in other hands, and used against the masses. The grain grows plentifully upon the soil, but that too is used against them. They have wages, but these are taken from them by the legerdemain of liquordom, and, as poor emasculated creatures, they hide their miserable heads in the horrid dens where death so speedily thins their numbers! Is there not manhood enough left us to put this foul iniquity down? Are even our "better classes" so lost to all that is truly noble that they will eat the fruit of such a murderous robbery, and hold their tongues? We do not believe it.

CHAPTER XXII.

DISASTROUS EXCHANGE.

BECAUSE men will part with produce of all kinds for gold and silver, and again part with gold and silver for produce, what is called "money" forms a convenient medium of exchange. But because of this same character of money it becomes a tremendous power in the hands of those who manage to accumulate it largely. He who has a great command of money, among those who have little command of it, can easily make his own even the very necessities of life produced by his neighbours. Such a man as the Duke of Portland will come down into the north of Scotland, and, simply because of the money at his command, will sweep off both landlord and tenant from many square miles where once lived a happy and noble people. But we need not dwell on this which all men know so well.

It is more important to see how the money is now passing rapidly into a few hands, so that the lives of the population are sacrificed to the pleasures of a few rich men. The liquor and tobacco traffic are the grand means by which this passage is effected. All other means are as nothing to these. Some men of mark are awaking to this truth, but they approach it as if they were afraid to speak it out in full. For

example, in the estimate usually formed of the cost of the liquor consumed in the United Kingdom, "spirits"—that is, "proof spirits"—are taken at twenty shillings a gallon, although this liquor is actually sold to the poorest of the people at twenty-two shillings, after being diluted with more than a fourth of water! So low an estimate is nearly as good as none, inasmuch as it tends to hide rather than to expose the true state of the case. Then the tobacco money is left out altogether, because so many temperance men "smoke," and "smokers" are easily offended! This again hides the true state of the case. The wine, too, and other drinks consumed almost exclusively by the classes whom the system enriches, are included in an estimate, the chief object of which is, or ought to be, not to show how they keep themselves a little lower than they might otherwise be, but how they are placed so unhappily out of their true relations to the rest of their fellow-men. We think it of great moment to look at the question of money spent from this momentous point of view.

The British spirits sold chiefly as whisky or gin are consumed by the mass of the people, and not to any appreciable extent by the wealthier classes. Three "proof" gallons of whisky will stand a gallon of water and be "strong" when compared with the liquor sold to the masses at sixpence a gill. But the glass gill (sold at sixpence) holds only enough to make 44 gills in the gallon. If the gill is not glass, but an imperial measure, the charge is at lowest

sevenpence. We must take the matter as it stands, and hence put twenty-two shillings as the money paid for a gallon of diluted spirit. To him who carefully inquires into the matter this will be found sufficiently under the mark to make our calculations more than "safe."

There were 21,008,634 gallons of proof spirit consumed in the United Kingdom in 1868.* We must add for water to this 7,002,878 gallons, making altogether 28,111,512 gallons at twenty-two shillings each. That is, £30,922,663, 4s., for whisky and gin alone, handed to the ruling and liquor vending classes, who receive this enormous annual sum from the millions of spirit-drinkers.

To see this item in its true colours, it is necessary to consider the real value, or cost price of this liquor. It can be made with a profit at one shilling and fourpence a gallon. We have a price card of a distillery offering it (*"proof"*) at *one and threepence*. It is averaged in the report of the Inland Revenue for 1867 at one shilling and tenpence and two shillings and sixpence the proof gallon. The Report says—"The prices of British spirits, in the year 1866-67, varied between 11s. 10d., and 12s. 6d." That is including 10s. of duty, and consequently, without duty, 1s. 10d. and 2s. 6d. But 1866-67 was a year of high-priced grain, and consequently of high-priced spirits. In 1865-66 the price was as low as 1s. 3d., as we see by the price card before us. We may

* Oliver & Boyd's *Almanac*, 1870. Page 270.

“safely” take a general average price at two shillings the proof gallon; that is, two shillings as the prime cost of that which sells, when diluted, at twenty-seven and sixpence! Even if the article were itself good, and used for good purposes, the proportion of duty and profit which we thus indicate would be ruinous; but when the article is bad and pernicious, so that it causes vast loss to the mass of the people, it is not possible for them to escape poverty under such a drain. But this is not all, nor half.

The “malt liquor” bill is the next in importance, and it is truly enormous. In the estimates which we have seen, this is vastly understated. By the report of Inland Revenue for 1867, the bushels of malt on which duty was charged are stated by the Commissioners as 50,915,828.* Two bushels of malt give a barrel of strong beer—that is, 36 gallons, such as is sold to the publican at one shilling a gallon.† This is sold to the public at sixpence a quart, or, when taken in glasses, a good deal higher. What we must see as nearly as possible, in every such calculation as this, is the actual money that passes away from the hands of the mass of the people. Now, sixpence a quart is two shillings a gallon, or seventy-two shillings a barrel. It is estimated usually at forty-eight shillings; but such an estimate is nearly as good as none, if we wish really to see how it is that the majority of the nation

* See Report, page 8.

† See Report on Malt Tax, Parliamentary Paper, 470, page 13, 1867.

are becoming so miserably poor, and the minority so rich. The working man who drinks beer or porter (as the mass of Englishmen do) pays above seventy-two shillings for 36 gallons, and it is this which tells us the truth as to his poverty. What then is the gross sum calculated thus? It is £93,467,854, 16s., for strong beer and porter alone!

The proportion of money we spend for nothing is truly incredible. In the evidence given on the malt tax, to which we have already referred, it is stated by Mr. Ellman, one of the witnesses called, that the beer that he himself brewed cost him 19s. a barrel, and was a great deal better than that for which he paid 54s. He stated that he could make beer for 12s., as good as that sold to the publicans for 36s. (duty paid). He was stating the prime cost of this liquor if excise restrictions and duty were removed.* This shows us 12s. worth sold for 72s.! That is, a shilling for twopence worth of liquor. But in the same parliamentary paper we have Mr. Rendall's evidence to the effect that he could produce beer at 30s. the 100 gallons, as good as that for which the brewer charges 1s. a gallon! The publican selling in glasses has above 2s. a gallon for the same! That is, 2s. for that the prime cost of which need not be above 3½d.! Though this is not so terribly outrageous as the spirit rate, let any man ask himself how

* Parliamentary paper, 470, page 76, 1867.

long it will be that a people who madly spend their earnings at this rate will keep out of consuming poverty?

The profits of the manufacturers of liquor are incredible. We know that one of our large joint-stock breweries divides among its shareholders as high as 30 per cent. of yearly dividend on their shares. It was stated, in connection with a statement by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons as to the duty paid by Mr. Bass, the great London brewer, that his profits were equal to £1,000 a day, Sabbaths included, throughout the whole year. Equally startling facts could be stated in abundance, if it were necessary. But one has only to look at the fact that £1,000 is laid out on the decorations of a single liquor shop, and by the returns drawn from the wretched dupes of the system the concern is found to pay, and that magnificently. When we know that not one farthing's worth of real good is given in return for the money thus given over to liquor men, is it difficult to see what must be the result?

When looking at such a point as this, we are reminded of the fearfully bad debts of the manufacturers of liquor, and that these bad debts are enormous because of the duty. If, for example, a publican fails to pay a gallon of spirits, it would be but a loss of a shilling or so were it not for the tax; but with that it is at least ten shillings more. So with beer to a smaller degree; but the drinker

must pay for all this. He is not allowed to get into debt so as to become bankrupt to the publican. You can see him going with his bed and bolster on his shoulders to the pawnshop,—he may lie on the bare boards, but he must pay for his liquor !

We are reminded, too, of the malt used in beer exported, which ought to be deducted from the sum of 50,915,828 bushels ; but there are items to counter-balance this drawback more than sufficiently. The sugar used in brewing has not been included in our estimate. There is also the fact that two bushels of malt produce a considerable quantity of the beer sold at sixpence a quart, beyond the barrel of 36 gallons. In the report on the malt tax, to which we have already referred, this is abundantly evident. Then, 1867 was an exceptionally low year in malt-making. We are aiming at the actual money passing from the masses for this article, and we cannot but be under the mark in the estimate we have formed of the vast sum.

We come now to foreign spirits. We take 1867 again as a low year. We had 4,312,857 gallons of rum retained for home consumption that year. These are gallons at proof strength, and, when considerably reduced, sell at ninepence a gill over the counter—say we take them at the low rate of 27s. a gallon when they reach the drinker's hands. That is a sum of £5,822,056 for rum alone. We had then 3,183,093 gallons of brandy. That sells at ninepence a glass (of which there are at least 88 in a gallon),

and so is a long way above £3 for that quantity.* That is £9,549,279 for brandy. There were then 842,334 gallons of "other foreign and Colonial spirits." These cannot be taken at less than the rum, and consequently give the sum of £1,137,250; while we leave out of sight altogether the cost of foreign wine introduced to the country.

We come next to the account for tobacco, and may continue with 1867, as it was, in this particular, something of an average year. The amount of this article retained for home consumption in that year was 40,729,611 lbs. This at the ship would cost, in its lowest qualities, 6½d. a pound, and before it could pass the Custom House 3s. 6d. had to be added. It sells as low as 4s. a pound to the smoker of what is called "roll," and would be parted with by men (who pay as high as, in some cases, £31, 10s. annually as license money for the privilege of selling it) at

* The following list of prices is taken from the printed circular of a large Spirit House in Leith :—

	Per Gallon.
BRANDY, Fine Pale, - - - -	44/
Do. Brown and Pale, - - - -	54/
Do. Pale, 10 Years Old, - - - -	60/
Do. Very Old, - - - -	72/ to 85/
Do. Very very Old, - - - -	112/

It will be seen from this that the *lowest* price is 44s. a gallon, while the liquor is sold as high as £5, 12s. ! In the liquor and tobacco trades, and in pawnbroking too, there is so much of deception that it is impossible to reach full estimates ; but we may rest perfectly sure of the *lowness* of those we have given above.

2s. 6d. a pound! Four shillings' worth for 2s. 6d. All this is explained when we know that in the process of steeping and spinning, the weed takes up about 50 per cent. of water. We know as matter of custom's report that it takes 42·61, but as matter of fact as much as 53 per cent. can be spun into it! If we include all items of expense, tobacco cannot cost the smokers less than 6s. 6d. a pound; though nominally it is, at the lowest, only 3d. an ounce. That is £13,237,123 as the yearly tobacco bill.

There is another serious item, which must be added to those which we have thus far noticed, in the enormous cost of the money advanced to the mass of drinkers by the pawnbrokers. This is as really money passing out of the hands of the many into those of the few as is that directly given for drink or tobacco, though we cannot get so near to its true amount as we can get to those sums directly paid for excisable goods. We may however form a not very incorrect estimate. In 1861 there were 6,085 persons engaged in pawnbroking in the United Kingdom. If we take the loss in interest and pledges sustained in connection with each of these in the course of a year, it must be considerably above £200. In our large city establishments this would be a fractional affair indeed, and yet it adds £1,217,000 to our sad estimate of reckless squandering, which is so rapidly reducing the masses of the people to deadly poverty.

To make our account complete, it is necessary to add one other item by estimate—that is, the drinks, such as cider and “Perry” (as it is called), of which we have no statistics. This is taken at the lowest as costing £1,500,000 yearly to the masses who consume it. It is set down at this sum in the low estimate of the *Companion to the British Almanac for 1870*, and might be set down correctly at a considerably higher amount.

What is then the great sum of actual money which flows in this most iniquitous channel? Home spirits, £30,922,663; beer, £93,467,854; rum, £5,822,056; brandy, £9,549,279; other foreign spirits, £1,137,250; tobacco, £13,237,123; pawn-broking, £1,217,000; unspecified drinks, £1,500,000. That gives us the terrible total of £156,852,225. From what we know of the private ways of the liquor trade especially, and also from the enormous losses of the pawn system, we feel perfectly sure that this annual sum, vast as it is, comes a good way below the truth; and it passes all *from* the lower orders in society, and in by far its largest half it passes *to* a small and already wealthy fragment of the people. He who gives the time and thought to this subject, which is beyond all question its due, will have no hesitancy as to how the land is escaping from the mass of the community.

CHAPTER XXIII.

WAGES, DRINK, AND TOBACCO.

ONE of the most curious things that strike one in studying our Social Politics, is the manner in which the mass of the labouring people are deceived in the matter of wages. If we take the sum which we have shown to be paid for drink and tobacco by the lower to the higher class, it is considerably above £5 a year for each person, young and old, male and female, in the entire population affected! If we take off 500,000, or if you will, 1,000,000 for the really upper class, and leave 29,000,000 as the lower, the sum shows about £5, 7s. for each person annually paid for worse than nothing, so far as social prosperity goes. That is, £26, 15s. from every family of five souls, which is above ten shillings a week from the winnings of every such family.

If we look at those struggles that are now so common, in which workmen "strike" for higher wages, and sometimes employers "lock out" their workmen because of combinations for this and similar purposes, we cannot find any evidence of an idea that rises to a wage such as would cover the dreadful expenditure to which we are thus directing attention. A shilling a week of

advance is deemed worth many weeks of entire loss of wages among workmen. Sixpence a day, that is three shillings a week, would be deemed something utterly extravagant, if men were to stand out for such an advance. But here are ten shillings a week going at the rate of a shilling, and even two shillings, for a pennyworth of worse than useless stuff, without either strike or complaint on the part of those who pay it !

Then see how the raising of wages affects the mass of the people in connection with this vast drain for liquor and tobacco. House rent in our larger towns has risen till anything like a wholesome dwelling is beyond the reach of the average workman. Everything depending for its price chiefly on labour is equally raised. Why is this? Almost entirely because wages are so much raised. So far as working men must use the produce of their own labour, so far they must pay the advance on their own labour. Nothing can be clearer than this. Let all the men employed in raising a block of workmen's houses, from the quarrymen to the painters who finish the work, have short hours and high wages, and no power on earth will make the rents of these houses low. The men who occupy these houses must pay these high rents. And so is it with all other produce of labour; in proportion as wages are high that must be high also. There is consequently an immense drawback on high wages in the increased expenditure which

they necessarily involve on the part of working men. From the vast number that have to be housed, clothed, and fed at the direct expense of the labouring class, this drawback is serious indeed. Few are aware of the extent of this increase of expenditure caused to the workman by any advance of wages. It is difficult—we might almost say impossible—to get the attention of working men generally turned to the subject; but that makes the drawback none the less. It only makes them wonder and despair when they find that high wages do so little to improve their social condition.

But there is no drawback in favour of the masses to counterbalance the tremendous outlay of ten shillings weekly for each family on drink and tobacco. The drawbacks are all the other way. The rich man who is enriched by the liquor traffic has a trifle more to pay for the labour he employs, but that is nothing to him; and it is next to no help to the workman who is giving all he gets back again in this ruinous way. A very little drink and tobacco is sufficient to cover all the extra cost of labour. But there are terrible drawbacks in connection with these on the workman. Ten shillings spent weekly by a family on these articles will cause five shillings less to come into that family. In the case of a joiner who spent less than ten shillings a week, we should say, his wages were examined for eight weeks before he took the pledge of abstinence, for eight weeks during which he kept

the pledge, and for eight weeks after he broke it. The difference against the drinking time was above seven shillings a week. This was drawback indeed—but on the same side as that of higher wages—against the poor deluded man and his poorer family. The sum with which we are dealing represents ten shillings given away with the result of seven shillings less won!

There is another drawback too important not to be mentioned in this connection. The family out of which ten shillings a week go for liquor and tobacco, and in which seven shillings less are won on that account, must always buy in the dearest market. Ready money is a thing unknown to great numbers of our labouring millions. The “bad debts” made in those districts where vast numbers of workmen live are incredibly large and regular. The workman, as a rule, has nothing, or next to nothing, to lift in wages, if he buys from a “store” at the work where he is employed. If he does purchase at that store he has a high per centage generally to pay on his goods; and if he buy on such credit as is precarious in a high degree, he must pay a higher per centage still. But how can he help himself and yet give ten shillings a week away for worse than nothing? The whole thing is against him, and can be against him only, so long as this terrible deception holds its power over him.

One of the most serious disadvantages of the masses is that which arises from the competitions of

poverty. Look, for example, to an acre of land in one of our suburbs, with such a house on it as will let for a rent of £100 a year. Then look to an acre of surface in one of our crowded "closes," say in Edinburgh. The houses on that acre will draw nearly £700 annually. How is this explained? Simply by the difference in competition for the house room on these different acres. A mere den in the crowd, which will let at £5 a year, will be sought for by twenty tenants for one who will look at the house rented at £100. For twenty such dens there will be twenty times twenty after them, if they are to let. This arises from the stern necessity which makes it impossible for our poor families to pay the higher rents of £10, £12, and £16 a year, at which houses at all tolerable can be had. The competition springing out of this state of things is truly dreadful; and with £26, 10s., for each family, of positive waste, and worse than waste, no remedy can be found in the nature of things.

Some will no doubt think that we are exaggerating the drawbacks on the working classes in these statements; but no one will think so who has given himself the trouble of examining, even in a very slight degree, the real facts of the case. A friend of ours, who lives in a mining district, tells us that he took the number of families and that of the public houses in the district. Allowing only two pounds sterling as the weekly profit of each public house—that is, two pounds a week with which to pay

all expenses, and reward the keeper of the house for his trouble—the amount spent in these houses was as high as fifteen shillings for every family in the neighbourhood, each week of the year. It is scarcely necessary to say that his calculation as to profit was set low. We are putting the tobacco along with the drink, and finding ten shillings as the average expenditure; and it is only folly to put it lower, or to keep out of sight the drawbacks to which we have referred. It is curious to hear men of mind and mark constantly speaking of it as erring on the “*safe side*” to put the estimate in this fearful matter *low*. Suppose a firm who should conduct their business on the idea that it was erring on the “*safe side*” to put their expenditure at 50 per cent. below the truth, what would the nature of the safety be? Would it not be a rather more satisfactory safety if they put it 10 per cent. above the truth? There can be no doubt on the point. We are not putting the case above the mark but below it, and yet our error is not on the safe side, but on that of just such danger as has led thousands of our productive classes down to that horrid poverty that is moving hearts of stone to feel for them.

CHAPTER XXIV.

IMPROVIDENCE.

THE mistake that is made in blaming the lower classes for their recklessness is so great and so cruel that we feel as if it merited a distinct chapter to itself alone. We have put the mere money given away for drink and tobacco at ten shillings weekly for every family of five persons. That would be two shillings a week for each person. If it were true that each unit in the lower class population spent that sum on these things, it might be reasonable to speak of the folly of the class in the way too often done. Or, if the families who spend nothing, or next to nothing, on these things were excluded, and it could be truthfully said that each unit of the families really affected spent three shillings weekly, there might be some reason for the charge of improvidence against the mass. But no such thing can be truthfully said, as all must know who think at all on the subject.

Men, women, and children are so related that the folly of one cannot possibly be confined in its effects to that one alone. All must see this by very slight thought on the relations of human beings. Here, for example, is a man earning good wages, but his wife has got fascinated with the drink which has

such power to lead women to destruction. In defiance of his utmost effort he finds himself without even decent clothing to appear in his place of worship on the Sabbath. Not only are all his wages gone, but even his very clothing, and the very bed on which he should lie, is sold! Is it anything short of cruelty to speak of that man's improvidence? Take another example. There is a wife who is yoked to a husband who patronizes the public house and tobacconist. She does her very utmost to save at every corner, yet her utmost is utterly vain, and both herself and her children are steeped in poverty by the expenditure of her husband. Does not that woman feel the sting of an unmerited reproach when she hears her class denounced as improvident, and their poverty spoken of as the result of their own folly? But take another case. There is both father and mother doing their very best to bring up and provide for their family, and by the fascination of liquor and tobacco taking effect on one son, they find the whole of them kept down in miserable poverty. Is not the charge of improvidence in such a case positively cruel? There, again, is the tradesman and small trader, who are doing their utmost to win an honest living, and to do well for their families, but they are actually beggared by the failure of those who have sent most of their earnings through the public house. Is the charge of "improvidence" fair against men and women who have risked their all to help starving families in a time

of need, and are rewarded by seeing the money which ought to have been paid to them secured by the publican? Those who spend their money in drink are no fair representatives of their class. They are a minority, when we take all, old and young, who are reduced to destitution by their folly. And hence nothing can be more unfair than to speak of this gigantic evil as the improvidence of the humbler classes.

The whole charge of improvidence is a mistake, to say the least of it. To see this we shall take a community of miners, say of a hundred families. There is no public house near them, nor any shop for selling tobacco. They are free from both of these ways of drawing off money from the many into the pockets of the few. Only a very small sum of taxation of any kind is paid by these families. They soon show signs of prosperity. Strikes and such things are unknown among them. But a set of so-called "Justices" license a liquor vendor, who sells tobacco also among these people. A certain portion of men and women will be acted upon successfully in the course of a few weeks—perhaps in the course of a few days. The number will be gradually increased, until from the families in that village, with very few exceptions, there will go out as much as ten shillings weekly from each family, for worse than nothing. Now, is it fair to charge that village, as a whole, with improvidence? The whole people are kept down; but it is not even by

the improvidence of the few, but by their weakness under the potent spell which destroys thousands of the very best men in all ranks in society.

For what end do the "Justices" license the liquor dealer? There is just one possible answer to this question in the light of fact, because there is just one end of a profitable character that can be gained. That end is the passing of ten shillings weekly from each of the families of that labouring community into the pockets of that class to which the "Justices" belong. That is, £50 a week going to swell the income of the upper class,—and that is no mean sum. We ought not, perhaps, to wonder when we see a lot of "Justices" grant three or four licenses for a village where every householder remonstrates against the granting of one. If four can ply their traffic successfully, it will probably be as good as £200 a week added to the income of upper class men, and those who gather for them. But is it not too bad to speak of this as the "improvidence" of the lower classes? We have known a husband come into the house after a night's drinking, in which he had spent all he could lay hands on. His wife had just sixpence in coppers to get food for the day for herself and child—six coppers which she and not he had won. He threatened her life if she did not give these coppers. She gave them, telling him they were her last. He took threepence halfpenny and gave her back the rest—went and gave what he had taken for half a gill of liquor. He was in-

sane with the dreadful thirst of the drunkard. He gave threepence farthing for absolutely nothing, and the remaining farthing for the very liquor that had cursed him and his. When you license men to bring about this sort of thing, what shall we call your cant about the "improvvidence" of these lower classes? It is not easy to find the proper word.

Poor frail humanity can be tempted. He who thinks himself the strongest is often the first to fall when the trial comes. It is consequently a tremendous affair to bring temptation to bear on men. Blessed is he that endureth it; but what shall be said of him who organizes it, licenses it by law, and, when its victims are perishing, plumes himself on his "providence," and speaks of the "improvvidence" of those led astray? We must leave the terrible subject.

CHAPTER XXV.

MONEY AND LAND.

THE most striking feature of the result of our present Social Politics is found in the dreadful dearth of land. There is a positive famine of space in which men may live and breathe. As in all other cases of famine, that which has become so dear and scarce to the people as a whole, is accumulated in the ownership of a few. Let us look at this in connection with the money matters we have just been considering.

The sum of £26, 15s. yearly, in the case of any family, saved, would in a very few years purchase a goodly quantity of land. We have taken the average rent at two pounds an acre. At twenty years' purchase that would be forty pounds as the purchase money of that extent of land. Take it at twenty-two years' purchase, and it is forty-four pounds. That is, less than two years' drink and tobacco money as all that is required to put an acre of good land into the possession of such a family. There are hundreds of our labouring families who, if they were directly and indirectly free from the drain of the liquor and tobacco traffic, would be perfectly able for this in two years. This is no matter of theory or speculation. It

is simply a matter of irresistible fact. Five years of such deliverance would give such a family a good house, even at present rates, and an acre of land on which to place it. Just such houses as could be wished for working families are raised in many parts of this country for £80 each, and five years of the saving we indicate would give more than the price of the land and houses also.

There is an idea that the law of entail, and also that "feudal tenure," are barriers in the way of the free sale of land. We shall probably soon see the last of these unrighteous laws. But what will be the effect if the drain to which we are calling attention is allowed to continue? Only that a few rich men will be able with somewhat greater advantage to purchase land. Lawyers will suffer a loss of work and fees. That is all. Working men, if really able, will have a small advantage in this also, should they purchase land; but that will be as nothing when compared with £26, 15s. a year for every family of five in their whole class.

There is a law, which no entail can hinder in its operation, constantly at work in redistributing the land of a country. It is that law by which luxury and idleness bring poverty even to the son of a millionaire. You see an old and supremely careful duke die, and leave untold wealth to his successor. The young duke revels a few years, and dies far from rich. Another duke follows, and is soon at the disposal of his creditors. Another soon follows him

in the same track, and in defiance of all human law the land comes into the market. In this way vast estates are ready for the highest bidder. Men who give away £26, 15s. a year for worse than nothing are not in a position to compete with those who get the money. Few things can be plainer than that. One man who has got this sum from a thousand families, as some brewers have, will not find much difficulty in having his own terms, in spite of all even that thousand families can do to hinder! But while this is plain enough, it is just as plain that, if the thousand families had retained their money, there would be no such rich man to compete with them in the case. Careful and right-minded land-owners, who are living honourably on the rent of the land which they honourably occupy, and who are doing their best to improve it to the utmost, have no desire to add field to field that they may dwell alone in the earth. Such men believe in their duty as fully as they believe in their rights, so that they are in no danger of competing with those in a more humble position, with a view to keep them off the land. Many of these men have cleared off the abomination of the public house from their estates of their own free will. But it is not so with the men who receive the proceeds of this grand wrong. It is not to be looked for that it should be so with them. Nor does it signify how it is with them, were not the wrong upheld by the entire force of British law. Let that wrong be suppressed by the

law as it is now upheld, and there could be no difficulty about the transfer of land. There is always abundance of that commodity in the market when there are rich enough persons to buy it, and with the sums we have indicated remaining with the masses, there would soon be abundance of purchasers.

In this connection, too, it is to be kept in mind that the money question is not the only one. The whole of the arable land of Scotland is no small surface, and if the money for drink were saved, that land would also be saved from its present terrible abuse. It is not only true that it would be available for food, for it would be equally available for any purpose to which land can be devoted. That amount of spare soil would be really in the market. One of the first things considered in reference to some of the finest farms in England is now, whether they will give good barley for malting purposes. Suppress the liquor traffic, and that purpose is gone. It would then be considered how to grow the best grain for food, or perhaps how to dispose of the land at a sufficiently high rate as to make half the breadth yield as good an income as the whole does now. With £26, 15s. a year added to the wealth of every family of five in the kingdom, it would not be difficult to dispose of land so as to make one half the breadth yield twice the present income. Now, the land is of exorbitant value only near the fearfully crowded centres of population; then, it

would be much more equalized in value, but still easily accessible to the mass of the people.

How little do the masses dream that something like this is involved in Sir Wilfred Lawson's Permissive Bill? We doubt if Sir Wilfred himself sees it. He is bent on securing something that would bring about sobriety among men now degraded with intemperance. He thinks of crime and pauperism, with all the immoralities of liquor. But if he thinks, he does not say much of the certainty of the people, when putting liquor, as at present sold, away from them, spreading themselves on the surface of the land. Possibly the United Kingdom Alliance think little of such a result. Certainly they do not say much about it. But as certainly the masses who are chiefly interested think little, if at all, on such a subject. The opponents of suppression think more clearly. Those men who pocket the £26, 15s. a year from hundreds, and even thousands of families, and find themselves the lords of the soil, are alive to the change involved in the Permissive Bill. It is their interests that are threatened by that measure. They will yield it only when the overwhelming force of public sentiment compels them.

This makes it all the more important that the true nature of the battle should be understood. We are apt to fight as if for one thing when we are really fighting for a very different thing. Hence we are apt to have foes in those who would other-

wise be friends, and only sham friends in those who should be open foes. It will be a strange thing indeed, if once working men are fully aware that they are paying at the rate of £26, 15s. a family for worse than nothing, every year, because of the infamous license system, should they be found failing to vote down the man who is brazen-faced enough to ask their votes to enable him to uphold it. They really uphold such men now and put them actually into Parliament. Many of them join in hooting down the speakers and candidates who propose to deliver them from the hands of their plunderers! But all this is the result of that incredible ignorance in which so many who can read, write, and cipher too, are still held. It will be otherwise if once they were really "educated."

CHAPTER XXVI.

INCIDENCE OF TAXATION.

ONE of the ways in which we see how the liquor and tobacco traffic is weighing upon the masses is that of observing the reduction and increase of taxation as these go on in our present system. For example, we go back to 1863, which was the last of three years of high income tax, and we observe that in the aggregate, that which is strictly upper and middle class taxation—called “Stamps, Taxes, and Property and Income Tax”—amounted to £22,711,000. In 1868 this had fallen to £19,227,000. There was consequently £3,484,000 less paid by these classes in 1868 than was in 1863. If we then take spirits, malt, and tobacco, through the purchase of which the labouring masses pay their chief taxation, there was an increase of revenue to the extent of £4,299,651. There was a reduction of £3,600,000 on tea, which so far benefited the toiling millions; but even if we could credit the whole of that to their account, it would still appear that they had a serious increase of taxation at the same time that those in better circumstances had a great reduction. By the increased amount paid on liquor and tobacco in those years, the poorer classes were keeping up to its high level the ex-

penditure of the country, and enabling the higher classes to relieve themselves, through their special taxes and their large share in the reduction on tea, to the extent of something like £5,000,000 annually.

There is a way of reasoning on this which betrays almost absolute ignorance of political economy. It is held to be the right and just way to make the wasteful pay the chief burdens of the State. This might be all very well if these same wasteful ones were the non-productive portion of society, who either could not, or would not be of any use to the general community. But instead of this, they are the very men, women, and children, on whom the community depend absolutely for the bread they eat, the clothing they wear, and the houses in which they live. There is not one morsel of bread that the Queen herself puts into her mouth that was not produced from the soil by the toil of the labourer. Put down that labourer, and where are those who live only because he effectively toils? Disable that labourer, and who shall give the same amount of needed produce to the community? Diminish in any way the efficiency of our productive classes, and by what process conceivable will you make the nation prosperous? Take an illustration. There is a traveller, and the only horse he has to carry him over his journey is not so well-behaved as he might be. He thinks the animal deserves to be shot, and he shoots him! Then how shall he get over his

journey? That the refractory brute *deserved* to be so treated, if that were true, would not go far to help the infatuated traveller!

But such an illustration gives us only one aspect of the case. We must return to the anxiety of the "Justices" as to licensing places for the sale of liquor among working populations. It is this base business of license that creates the wasteful habits of those whom it is deemed right to fleece so freely in the way of taxation. It is really wicked to insist that the people are improvident and wasteful when they cry out with one voice against the temptations of the liquor shops, and have these temptations thrust upon them by such "Justices." It is of no use to try to hide the truth. These "Justices" manage to place £5,000,000 annually on their own side of the account by the taxation movements on which we are now remarking, and that in spite of the remonstrances of the great majority of the people on whom they operate. They lower their own state expenses by this amount at the same time that they increase that expenditure for the poorer class by more than an equal sum. They weaken to this extent, by this management alone, the very hands upon whose industry they depend for even their daily food. This is one of the most unwise, as well as unrighteous things that men could do. No doubt the people on whom the iniquity is practised are ignorant and foolish; but they are, after all, the people by whose energy alone we can continue to

exist as a nation, and surely no folly can be greater than to think of enriching the state by their degradation.

But we must not forget that the proper parties to address on this subject are the working classes themselves. There is but a minority of these classes that are blind enough not to see that the legislation of the kingdom in those matters now before us is all dead against them. We surely cannot come to the conclusion that a majority of working men can rejoice in millions of reduction in taxation which they do not pay, accompanied with millions of increase in taxation which they do pay. Their heads have not become so absolutely wooden that they can fail to see how the game goes. And they have the remedy in their own hands. Instead of tamely begging a government which has beggared them to ship them off to distant shores, they may be expected to demand of that government to suppress the wrong that has brought them to such a pass.

CHAPTER XXVII.

EMIGRATION.

So long as there is inhabitable surface on the earth not yet occupied, it is probable we shall have emigration. This abstract thought, however, has very little to do with the actual facts of emigration as it now goes on. It is, as we have seen, a great delusion for men to think that our emigrants are going away from us because there is no room for them in their native land. It is a still greater delusion to imagine that it is a relief to those who remain behind to be quit of those who go. If our readers will give us a little careful attention, we may be able to make the truth clear as to our situation in this important matter.

In 1815, the total emigration from the United Kingdom was 2,081—in 1866, it had risen to 204,882. That is such an increase as may well arrest the attention of all who feel interested in their country. There were higher years than 1866; but these had to do with the gold fever, and need not be taken into account in our present paper. In 1852, for example, the number of emigrants rose to 368,764; but 87,881 of these went to Australia or New Zealand. It is to the steady flow of nearly 200,000 persons a year, as reached from the small

beginning—2,081 in 1815—that it is interesting to turn attention.

And yet it is far more interesting to consider the destination of these emigrants. The number from 1815 gives a grand total of 6,106,392 persons, and of these no less than 5,044,809 went to North America. Large as the Australian and New Zealand exodus has been, it reached only 929,181 in 1866; that is, it had not reached one million when the American had gone beyond six. It is important, too, to notice that by far the largest number of our emigrants to America go to the United States. In 1866 those to the “colonies” were 13,255, while to the States they reached the high number of 161,000. It is therefore very clear that it is with America we have specially to do in considering the bearings of this vast and growing emigration. The States of America *are not now a new country*. They begin to have all the characteristics of an old established nation, especially in their northern and eastern portions. New England is a well peopled region of the world; and, to as great an extent as Old England, it may be regarded as a manufacturing country, and certainly not a land remaining to be occupied. An emigration from Britain to these States is not a going forth to subdue the wilds of the earth’s surface, but to increase the population of large manufacturing centres.

This leads us, however, to notice further, the

nationality of the emigrants going from us. Up to 1847 the emigration was from Ireland in a very much larger proportion than from the rest of the empire. During the following eight years the flow from Ireland became comparatively low, though it still keeps up to a high rate. The emigration from Scotland was next in importance to that of Ireland, when the extent of our population is taken into account. England, with six times as many people as Scotland, sent but few emigrants till of late years. The Irish emigration was so great that in 1851 the census revealed a deficiency in the population amounting to 2,555,720. That is, had Ireland had no emigration in the ten years previous to 1851, she would have had 2,555,720 people more than were actually in the island. In 1861 there had been a positive decrease of 751,251, instead of an increase of a much larger figure, and it is anticipated that there will be a still more important decrease in 1871. In 1851, but more so in 1861, Scotland was found to be affected in a somewhat similar way, though not to the extent of producing an actual decrease in the number of the people. Instead of an increase of 12 or 13 per cent., as was in former decades, there was only one of 6 per cent. from 1851 to 1861. The rate of increase in England and Wales had not been sensibly affected. Now the chief stream of emigration is flowing from England. In the first or winter quarter of the year 1869 the emigration was 2,702 Scotch, 9,800 Irish, and 11,110

English. It need not be told any one who thinks and reads at all on the subject that it is now in England almost exclusively we have excitement in connection with emigration. And we may assuredly calculate that the census of 1871, and far more fully that of 1881, if matters go on as now, will reveal a decrease in the population south of the Tweed.

What is the great relation in which these three kingdoms stand to each other and mankind? Ireland is agricultural and pastoral; so is Scotland to a great extent; England is the workshop for these and for the world. There is a small manufacturing power in Ireland, a much greater in Scotland, but by far the greatest of all in England. This explains how emigration did not set in on England, or on Scotland, as it has done on Ireland. It also explains why it did not till now affect England as it has affected Scotland. A pastoral people are the first to emigrate in the course of nature. An agricultural people are the next in order. From a land like this a manufacturing people would never emigrate if matters were right. The climate and mineral store of this country are such that no other country can at present compete with it in manufacturing power, if the natural course of things were followed. Even our shepherds have an immense advantage at home, and our farmers have a still greater advantage, but our manufacturers have so great facilities as can scarcely at present be equalled. It is, consequently,

matter of extreme interest when we find that England is emigrating.

It introduces us to the mining, mechanical, and manufacturing character of our emigrants now. There are above 70,000 souls in the east end of London who must emigrate speedily or die. They are being shipped off as fast as charity and Government can transport them to North America. Above 25,000 of these are workmen more or less skilled in engineer and shipbuilding occupations. These are not shepherds, nor are they ploughmen, nor will they ever be to any great extent one or the other. They are mechanics, and will be so go where they may. In the vast hives of industry in Lancashire there are a greater number who must emigrate or die. These are getting off as fast as they possibly can to Massachusetts to find full occupation in cotton. Not one is either pastoral or agricultural, and few are likely ever to be either. Irishmen and Scotchmen can be anything, but not so Englishmen, and they will not need to be anything in the world but what they have been. Their skill is too valuable to be sent to the backwoods when abundance of rough hands are there already, and skilled men are needed to make a great country fit to manufacture for itself. Till within the last four years our emigrants were chiefly pastoral and agricultural, now they are chiefly mining, mechanical, and manufacturing. It is to this that we feel it of such importance to call attention. Our position as a

nation depends, to a great extent, upon our usefulness to the world in a mechanical and manufacturing line. Commerce has its being in the fact that one nation is so situated that it excels in one thing, while another excels in another. It is in the exchange of produce that all trade lies, and such exchange clearly depends on the excelling we have mentioned. If this nation loses its excellence in manufacturing power it loses its only possible share in the exchange of the world, and its commerce dies.

We must also look at the effect of emigration on the character of the population left behind. How do the Emigration Commissioners account for the vast deficiencies in the population of Ireland? More than two millions and a half of deficiency was double the emigration, but it was accounted for by the fact that the *young men and women* had gone off to such a degree that marriages and births had fallen off sufficiently to account for all. "The proportion of persons between the ages of twenty and thirty-five," in the ordinary settled course of society, is about 25 per cent.—that proportion among emigrants is above 52 per cent. This is not the only matter of consideration at this point. Miss Rye, in a letter to the *Times*, some months since, said—"I will not, I dare not, spend my time in passing bad people from one port to another." And "bad people" cannot, as a rule, pass themselves; they have generally no inclination to do so. No doubt bad enough people go, but that is not the rule. We dare not now send

our criminals abroad, nor dare we send our paupers, nor should we be allowed to send any class unfit to support themselves. It is the best of our mechanical and manufacturing hands that are now going, and they are leaving the proportion of those who burden society largely increased. It is amusing to read in journals of good and even high standing that our only remedy for our helpless poor is to ship them off to other lands ! One can hardly believe his own eyes when he sees such absurdity placed before the world with all the solemn dignity of journalism in influential places. It needs but half an hour's reading on the part of a ploughboy to enable him to perceive that such writing is only solemn nonsense.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

DIMINISHING FORCE.

NOTHING can be more self-evident than that the wealth of a people depends on the largeness of the number who produce as compared with that of those who only consume. If by any means the producers are diminished while the consumers are increased in number, the prosperity of that community must be lowered. And yet this is the sure and certain effect of emigration, as it goes on from this country now.

Our productive workmen above twenty years of age number about 4,500,000. We exclude all our men under twenty years of age, as well as all women workers, for the very clear reason that as a whole these produce only about as much as they themselves consume. Very many of them do more, but a still greater number do less; and hence they cannot be taken as forming any part of that labouring power by which the unproductive population of a country is sustained. It is not to these classes that we can rationally look for that on the amount of which prosperity essentially depends. We therefore must regard these 4,500,000 men as the productive force of the nation, *so far as human skill and labour go*. We exclude the vast number who

are employed in police, prison, and similar labour, together with the criminals who supply the occasion for that labour, as well as all others who are consuming, but not adding in the least, directly or indirectly, to the common store.

It at once suggests itself as a question of grave interest whether, in proportion to the great non-producing force which only consumes, these productive workmen are proportionally diminishing or increasing. Without any deduction we should have 23,500,000 to be provided for by the labour of 4,500,000. This would not be extravagant if there were no drawback, for one able-bodied man can produce easily for seven, or even for nine persons. But to be somewhat exact, we must deduct all those under twenty years of age among the men, and all those women who work for something like their own support at least. These are no burden upon any one. They amount to 502,753 in Scotland alone, and at least eight times that number in England and Ireland, and so leave 18,976,223 as the strictly non-productive portion of society to be balanced by the 4,500,000 able-bodied producers. Among these we have all the children, and the women engaged usefully in attending to them, or to themselves and others, together with all the disabled in any way. But we have also, as we have said, all the criminal and pauper classes, together with all who attend directly and indirectly upon these. If any or all of these classes are increasing in proportion to the

productive classes, who do more than sustain themselves, the burdens are certainly becoming heavier, and the nation is to that extent becoming less able to keep its position in the world.

Here, then, the character of our emigration stands first for notice. The proportion of persons in ordinary old country society between the ages of twenty and thirty-five is 25 per cent., while in the case of emigrants it is nearly 53 per cent. Let us look into this. We assume that our emigration for 1869 shall turn out to have been 200,000. It will probably be found to have been more, but take it at that. In this we have as many as 106,000 persons capable of productive labour, while among 200,000 in ordinary society we should have only 50,000. It is quite true that these are not all working men so as to belong to the class numbered at 4,500,000, but a very large majority of them are, while only a minority remain among those left behind. When, however, we endeavour rightly to estimate the number of productive workers among emigrants and among home society we must reduce the amount by some thousands in both cases on account of non-productive persons of the ages implied. Every emigrant above twenty or under thirty-five is not a productive worker, nor is every person in ordinary society of such age. But a much larger proportion of such emigrants are productive than of those in ordinary society. It is thus that we put down nearly 100,000 out of the 200,000 in the one case, and 40,000 in the other.

We take off 6,000 from the emigrants, and 10,000 from those in society of an ordinary character.

This suggests to us a subject of the very gravest consideration. That will appear if we take 400,000 persons as they stand in society before any of them emigrate, and look at the manner in which emigration affects them. At the rate of 25 per cent. we have 100,000 among these 400,000 who are above twenty years of age, and under thirty-five. Now, suppose that 200,000 out of the 400,000 emigrate; among these emigrants, if there were 53 per cent. of persons between the ages specified, there would be 106,000. This is impossible, as there were not so many of such ages to begin with—but the emigrants have taken every person between twenty and thirty-five with them! Had there been 6,000 more, they would have taken them all still! They have left 200,000 persons out of the 400,000 under twenty or above thirty-five! But you say rightly that this is not likely to occur among so small a population.

Well, try it with one larger. Say we have a population of 600,000. Among these we have only 150,000 between the ages of twenty and thirty-five. Let us suppose that 200,000 emigrate from among these. They take with them 106,000 persons between the ages in question. They consequently leave only 9,000 such persons in a population of 400,000—that is, 9,000 to 391,000! Well, it is probably said again, that such an emigration cannot occur from so small a population.

Let us see then how it affects 28,000,000. We have taken these imaginary cases in order to make the principles more clear to the reader. If only the proper proportion of persons between the ages of twenty and thirty-five went from us in an emigration numbering 200,000, the proportion would be 50,000. But actually 56,000 go in addition to these. It is a clear loss of 56,000 persons in the prime of life, and it leaves 56,000 not in that prime, instead of this army of strength which it takes away. It is equal to a diminished force of 56,000, and the proportion of that number which, at the rate of 25 per cent., would make up for an increase of 56,000 to the less effective classes. We may, however, look at the matter in another way.

The number of persons in the United Kingdom, between the ages of twenty and thirty-five, is about 7,000,000, leaving 21,000,000 as either under the one or over the other of these ages. How does one year's emigration affect this proportion? It takes 106,000 from the 7,000,000, and only 94,000 from the 21,000,000. It leaves 6,894,000 against 20,906,000, instead of 7,000,000 against 21,000,000. In the case of 7,000,000 against 21,000,000, the difference on the side of weakness is 14,000,000; but in the case of 6,894,000 against 20,906,000, the difference is 12,000 more. Hence the emigration of 200,000 takes this 12,000 from the scale in the weight of this nation, and adds it to the scale of those nations to which the emigrants go.

This is seen much more forcibly when you take the process as it goes on year after year. It is 12,000 next year as well as this, as it has been for years gone by, constantly increasing the proportion of the very young or of the old, and it must tell with increased effect as years go on. It is because of this progressive character of the effect thus produced by emigration that Ireland has decreased to so large an extent in its birth rate, for want of marriageable men and women among its population. It has told there with extreme power, and it is going on to the point at which it is telling on Scotland, as last census proves, and will tell also on England.

There are some features of our social struggle that illustrate this point, and that are themselves of great importance. One of these is the anxiety of working men to "limit the number of apprentices." Nothing that men ever dreamed of is more truly unjust than this. To say to a young lad who has been born on God's earth, and can have no crime charged against him, "You shall not learn to handle a hammer, or a saw, or a type"—is about as vile a tyranny against that lad as man can be guilty of against his fellow. No man worthy of his humanity can put himself in that lad's place without feeling that it is so. If masons, and joiners, and printers may prohibit such a lad from acquiring their crafts, so may all other workmen, and so may they forbid their fellows to live. The thing is simply infamous. But it is of

no use merely to denounce a social wrong without pointing out its real cause. When men are drafted off from a nation, and boys are left, then the boys become numerous in excess. They crowd in on all the openings that occur in extreme numbers. Employers soon find that by selecting from among these lads they can have work done at a rate at which grown men cannot do it. The men are enraged at the boys, and are driven to the tyranny to which we have referred, like a starving crew who are prepared to eat one another in their last extremity. Such tyranny would be impossible in a community where men were plentiful and boys scarce. In such a state of things men are proud of every lad, like noble well-to-do fathers of their sons, and would as soon put their feet into the fire as forbid the youths rising to the noblest positions they can attain. But it is otherwise where men are few and their poverty keen, while boys are in superabundance. Then, alas! all the lowest and meanest elements of humanity are seen in the effort to drive off our rising youthful men!

Here is another feature. What a cry for "training ships" in which to stow away our superabundant youth! Why have we so many more boys than can be disposed of in the useful trades, that we must organize methods of such an expensive class as this? Because we are scarce of grown men. The effort to provide the nation with men in this way is vain. After spending vast sums on such work, the issue is

worthless. It is not the interest of those who are paid for the training to see this, but it is the interest of society. If we train ever so many boys, we shall not find that our able-bodied seamen increase. So soon as they become able-bodied they find it their best course to leave us for a more favoured nation. It is thus that 56,000 a year above the proper proportion of people in the prime of life leave us, and it is not conceivable that they can go without constantly leaving an extreme proportion of youths behind.

Then there is another feature—that of our reformatories and ragged schools of all grades. What is it which calls for these? Our troops of boys and girls for whom no one has any use. You see them in floods where they are not wanted, and policemen hunting them off, as it were, out of the world! Like so many wild pigeons that are treated as pests by the farmers, so are our own flesh and blood at the most interesting of all ages driven away, and would be shot if our little remaining humanity would allow. “Go about your business,” roars the gruff man who abhors the boys, little thinking that they have no business about which to go! They are there in everybody’s way, because in proportion to the men who could manage them, and the profitable labour which would absorb them, they are redundant.

It is beyond all dispute that this increases the burdens left behind by emigration in proportion to the backs left to carry them. In the course of years

it will disable effectually the old country, while it increases in the same proportion the competing power of the new. At last census it was found that women had increased in the Scottish population 6·55 per cent., and men only 5·41 per cent. But the census of 1871 will probably show a very much greater disparity, inasmuch as the causes have been active on a larger scale, and all the effects will be correspondingly large. Our young men have been passing to America and Canada in vast numbers during late years, and this will show itself in the returns. Every one who has given the least attention to the subject knows that men in our colonies are greatly more numerous than women, and this is just because so great a number of the latter, and that of the most helpless, are left at home. Hence the untold miseries which so many of our sisters have to endure.

The march of pauperism comes next in order. No paupers emigrate. Since 1845 this class has increased 27 per cent. In Edinburgh, every tenth person is a pauper. It is assumed that the population has increased 17 per cent.; but Ireland has diminished. Scotland increased 6 per cent. during last decade, and will probably be found to have diminished during this one, while England is now having its exodus in turn. The "increase of population" is a favourite subterfuge with shallow politicians who wish to make it appear that our evils are not increasing. What do our census authorities

say? Calculating on the birth rate and death rate, they say—"The actual and natural decennial increase in Scotland, between the taking of the census in 1851 and 1861 would therefore amount to 405,185 persons, and that number added to the population ascertained to be in Scotland in 1851 would have caused the population in 1861 to have amounted to 3,293,927 persons; and the decennial rate of increase would have been 14·02 per cent., or greatly more than double what it proved to be." Yet it is not so much in its proportion to the mass as to the working class that it is important to view pauperism. We must take the sum of poor rate and divide it among the productive men, in order to see the real pressure of the burden which it entails. The annual legal cost of the poor in Scotland is now about £800,000. If we take the rate as the same for England and Wales in proportion to the population, it is six times as much; that is, £4,800,000—in both cases leaving out all voluntary support of the poor. In Ireland the alms must far exceed the rate, and we may safely take the actual drain on productive industry as proportionate to the population—that is, at £1,600,000. This gives us altogether for the nation the sum of £7,200,000 as representative of the share of produce consumed by the helpless poverty of the people. There are two workhouses connected with Edinburgh the buildings of which alone will cost £100,000. Years of work by hundreds of workmen have gone to rear

these houses. This is all labour expended without one stone being laid upon another for the benefit of the producing classes themselves, and that while their numbers in relation to the consuming multitude are constantly being diminished.

But the same thing is seen when we look at the criminal class in society. That is not diminished by emigration. We are shut up from transportation, and hence have a vastly increased force of police and prison officers to maintain, because of a constantly increasing criminal class in the community. Our present Home Secretary is fond of stating that crime has not increased during the time within which the population has very largely done so. In the face of this statement it becomes a very curious fact that an enormous addition is being made to the accommodation for prisoners. At Perth such an enlargement is now going on, and that only because smaller prisons are overcrowded and cannot get their long sentenced inmates sent on. A highly capable governor of one of our jails assures us that prisoners have increased $33\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. during less than the time during which Mr. Bruce says they have not increased at all. Emigration is not taking one from us. It is only taking our well behaved and capable workmen. By this the effective men are diminished in number, and their burdens increased. In the nature of things every mouth must be filled and every back covered by producing hands; and though money is given for the produce,

those who get it are none the richer when it is handed back for worse than nothing. Is it any matter for wonder if the working men who do this, while their ranks are being thinned by the emigration of those who joined in aiding them, should find it more and more difficult to live?

It may not be out of place here to notice that there is a burden of no small magnitude left behind among the working men in their own state of mind on social matters. Many of them actually think the less they work the better! And they insist that no man shall do more than a very limited amount of work if they can prevent him! They insist that no one shall learn to work beyond a very limited number! They and their children are actually dying in hundreds for want of houses to live in, and yet they think that the fewer houses they build the better! They are miserably clad, and yet they think the fewer clothes they make the better! They are in semi-starvation because of high prices, and yet they actually think that the higher they can make the cost of production, the better for them! They do not see that no power on earth can make houses plentiful but those who build them. Nor do they see that short hours and little done during them must issue in everything being scarce and dear—not beyond the reach of those who get the money for nothing, but assuredly beyond the reach of those who give half their money-wages away for worse than nothing. This is not to be altogether

separated from the effects of emigration. Our most intelligent and independent minds leave us. The spirit of those who remain suffers through this departure of the nobler element. The competition, too, of those who have left us, narrowing as it does the demand for our products, has its effect; and so our force in proportion to our numbers is sadly diminished. A landlord in Edinburgh told a friend of ours that he had a room in one of his houses which he let at 2s. 6d. a week. He thought it was large for the money, so he put a partition through it, halving the window at one end and the fireplace at the other. He then let each of the halves at 2s. 6d. a week! He had no difficulty in doing so. Houses at £10 yearly rent are now standing empty in considerable numbers, but at 2s. 6d. a week the smallest den is "run upon." Emigration will never thin the ranks of the poor. On the contrary, as going on with us, it will increase their multitude.

CHAPTER XXIX.

LESSENING PRODUCTION.

THERE are few things of greater importance to society at present than the political ideas of working men. Household suffrage has placed the choice of the nation's rulers in the hands of the sons of toil, and ere long they will choose those who are prepared to rule according to the political economy in vogue among the working classes. Every one, therefore, who cares for his country's weal must care for the enlightenment of those who will, ere long, be found wielding a power so momentous as that of determining what both the legislature and executive shall do.

If, then, we may draw our conclusions from some of the best sources of evidence, it is clear that the political notions prevailing among working men are sadly astray. One of the most prevalent of these notions is, that the prosperity of trade and of labour hangs upon the limitation of production. In an article we noticed lately in one of our most popular papers, a writer ascribes the present dull condition of the linen trade to over-production. His aim is to show that manufacturers have such an excessive armoury of plant in readiness, and their hands are so numerous, that whenever the least increase in

demand raises prices a shade, more than sufficient goods are produced to overstock markets and bring prices down. He actually implores the working men to set their hearts on shortening hours and lessening production if they would see prosperity again! He says—"Unless a general and permanent reduction of the hours of labour takes place, whereby mills and factories, and all other such places, will be reduced from sixty to fifty hours per week, we may look in vain for several years to come for any real and lasting improvement in the Fife linen trade." He is here only echoing an idea which seems to rule our trades' unions all over the world. Working men actually band themselves together to secure a limitation of produce! Yet these are the men by whose votes and influence the country must now be governed. Power is passing from those who have drawn as much as possible of the produce out of the hands of producers into those of non-producers; and that power is passing, or rather has passed, to those who think that the less produced the better. In other words, the working-classes have hitherto been beggared by those who had power over them; and now, without attempting to stop the dreadful robbery, which more than accounts for all their embarrassment, they mean, by the additional evil of enforced idleness, to ruin themselves!

Let us see that we neither misrepresent nor exaggerate the case as it stands. It will not be

easy to dispute the maxim that he who makes two stalks of corn to grow where, but for him, one only would have grown, is a benefactor to his kind. The maxim applies to every other thing as well as to corn—that is, to everything which goes to sustain life and increase the happiness of human beings. He who causes two pairs of shoes to be made where one pair only would have been made but for him is in the same category with the grower of the two stalks of corn. So is he who causes two yards of cloth to be woven where one would only have been so but for him. So with all others who do this in any matter required by man. But our limiting friends argue as if the opposite were true, and as if he who makes only one shoe when he might make two were deserving praise, while he who makes the two merits the censure of his fellows! He who works on Monday, and turns out the greatest number of good and durable articles, is not to be placed on the same high level as he occupies who idles both Mondays and Tuesdays, and turns out the fewest! Beyond all question, the latter limits production and saves the market from being overstocked! Perhaps we should not wonder that it gratifies a lazy fellow to find himself praised for his very laziness, and yet it is astonishing that men, as a class, can be so gratified. There, for instance, is a lot of loungers at the busy crossing of two streets, with their hands in their pockets, and a preacher of political economy goes up to them and commences with—"Well done,

good and faithful men; ye are the benefactors of human kind. Yours is the true way to enrich your families and friends." Is it not wonderful if they accept the praise and fail to see the sarcasm? And yet, one way or other, they constantly do so.

Well, what are the facts? How many shoe-makers' wives and children are absolutely without shoes? How many tailors' sons are without coats? How many spinners' wives and children are without proper clothing? How many masons' and joiners' families are without fit houses to put their heads into? What an amount of privation is everywhere suffered because of the scarcity of those things that are produced by working men! And yet they imagine that somehow it will mend matters to produce fewer of these things than are now produced! The idea is that, because the more scarce any article is in the country the higher its money value, somehow dearth is a benefit to the working man! But in what possible way can the raising of the price of these things which working men need bring such things in greater abundance to them? Money can neither be eaten nor worn, and if necessities are high, high wages can bring them in no greater measure. Though things are scarce, and consequently dear, the richer classes get them easily (because it makes only a slight difference to a man with a large income whether such things are high priced or low); but they are placed effectually beyond the reach of all the poorer classes. Take the article of shoes

as an illustration. So many thousands have no shoes at all ; so many have only the cast-off shoes of other persons ; so many have only an inferior sort of shoes though new ; only a small number (as trade now stands) have shoes thoroughly suited to health and comfort. Well, make shoes scarcer and dearer than they are now, what is the immediate and necessary effect ? The numbers who have none are increased, as certainly as two and two are four. The numbers who must wear second-hand shoes are also increased. So are those who must wear an inferior article. Those who have superior shoes or boots are lessened in number. There is no law in nature more irresistible than this. Well, the shoemakers think that making shoes scarce will bring more money to them ! But all other men, they must remember, are as free to act on this principle as are the shoemakers.

Say we take the spinners, weavers, and tailors, so as to have the clothing affected in a similar way to the shoes. So many thousands are now clad in dirty rags that should long since have been consigned to the papermakers, if not to the flames ; so many more are clad in cast-off clothing ; so many in coarse, uncomfortable stuff ; a few only are clad in comfort. You make clothing scarcer and dearer. The ragged inevitably increase in number, and the rags are longer worn, and so more filthy ; so are the whole of the various classes affected, as in the case of the shoes. Inevitably the number of shirtless shoe-

makers is multiplied. Thus the misery spreads. Yet he who spreads it by restricting labour is regarded as a worthy man of his class !

How are we to account for this infatuation ? It seems nothing short of infatuation. That the very men who are without the necessities of a comfortable life should conspire to make all these necessities more scarce can hardly be called anything else. And yet it is the result of leaving out of their account a few of the most obvious of political verities. For example, there is such a thing as *the world's market*. That is constituted by the mutual relation of all the markets in the world, in so far as they are accessible to mankind in their great collective capacity. When men insist on having liberty to buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market, they merely demand access to the world's great mart itself. The mercantile value of goods of any kind is not what they will bring in any particular place, but what they will bring when sold where, after deducting cost of transit, they will bring the highest price. The ingenuity of merchants is equal to the work of bringing goods into this market. They so manage as to cause that competition which speedily fixes the real value of all that is produced by man. In one place goods may be made so scarce that they will bring, for a little time, more than their real value ; but very soon similar goods are brought from elsewhere to that place, and the true price is established. So goods in one place may be

in greater abundance than is at all required, and the price may be lowered too far; but they are soon transferred to where they are scarce, and the true value is again secured. Produce is yet so far below the wants of men—in other words, there are yet so many starving and ill-clad, ill-housed thousands in the world—that “over-production” is ridiculous. The demand is irresistible. Hence, even in defiance of artificial restrictions, such as tariff laws, the highest value in the world’s market is maintained.

A glance at our export trade may profit us here. We may look at it in the light of the last returns issued by the Board of Trade. The total *value* of all British and Irish produce exported during the year ending on the 31st December, 1869, was £190,045,230. What does this *value* really mean? It is the utmost which the mercantile skill of the empire can bring in return for the goods of various kinds when these are ready to be carried off and sold in the world’s wide market. It is no arbitrarily fixed sum for which these goods may be sold, but merely the highest sum they will bring, exclusive of the cost of transit and profit of merchants. If you keep back any portion of the produce ready to be sent out, you have just so much less money returned, or so much less of other goods imported. It is not in the power of any conceivable combination to alter the laws which regulate the real value of produce. You may increase the nominal sum received for certain goods within a limited circle,

but even in doing this you only lower the value of money there and in relation to these goods. Let us, then, suppose that the linen trades of the kingdom should combine and lessen production, and that all other trades combine too, so that the sum of produce available for export shall be lessened by twenty-five per cent. What would the result be? Even if such a widespread change could be effected in the world that the same money could be secured for a fourth less produce, that would only lower the value of money by a fourth. But the same money would not be received. There is such a competition with us in the world's markets now as would prevent the price of our goods from being sensibly raised. We should have only £142,533,923 instead of £190,045,230 as the return for our exported produce; that is, we should in a year, in this one matter, be £47,511,307 poorer by the limitation of our produce. We should be twenty-five per cent. poorer in every imported comfort; that is, for every four articles we now enjoy we should have only three. The rich would not have much less on account of the dearth; but what would be the portion of the struggling poor? And yet this is solemnly published as the true way in which to benefit the working man!

If we look directly at our imports we may have yet a stronger view of this matter. In the return before us we have these for eleven months only, but they are so far uniform as to be easily calculable for

the year. They will reach £237,070,724 in 1869. If we take them at this sum, and deduct the exports, we leave £47,024,694; that is, we have introduced to our ports to that amount beyond what we have sent away. This £47,024,694 represents both the freight of goods and the profit of merchants engaged in our foreign trade. But it constitutes no part of the price of our exports. The producer receives no benefit from it. So far as it does not mean debt due to foreign countries it means only the advantage of our traders, not of our producers, who create our "British and Irish produce." These have sent out to the value of £190,045,230, and this they receive; but they must pay in money £47,024,694 over and above if they are to consume the sum of our imports.

Now, let us suppose that working men, in their combined strength, were to restrain production to the extent in which the restriction would lessen our exports by one-fourth of their value. They would accomplish this by a very slight restriction on produce as a whole; and yet they would be some forty-seven millions sterling poorer, and that much less able to buy our imports. Traders in such a case would suffer no doubt; but what would be the consequences to the mass of the people? Nothing is more sure than that if exports are not forthcoming, neither will imports. Foreign countries will not send goods to us except in return for goods sent out by us. Hence the issue of that which we here

suppose would be severe. There would be a privation among the masses of which we have little conception now. The price of everything would no doubt rise just as prices always do in famine; but this is only because money gets less in value as money's worth becomes hard to obtain.

Let us here look for a little to another view of the subject. Suppose the working classes combine and suppress the liquor and tobacco traffic. They thus, by one stroke, retain £154,000,000 a year which passes from them for worse than nothing. This vast sum becomes at once available for the purchase of goods such as now cannot be bought or worn for lack of purchasing power among the masses. Some working men try to console us, in view of the terrible expenditure on liquor and tobacco, by saying that "the money does not go out of the country." They console themselves with that which is not true. It does go out of the country, and can only be brought back by our exported produce. But, out of the country or in it, it is out of the pockets of the toiling millions, and hence all those trades that depend on their expenditure, except those in liquor and tobacco, are languishing. Remove these trades, and you have at once three millions a week to spend on home and foreign produce such as sustains and comforts the masses of the people. Is not this a more sensible way of bettering their condition than that of combining to make all things scarce and dear?

There is a most serious fact in the returns of trade between this country and the United States this last year of 1869. As we already pointed out in another part of this treatise, we had, in 1868, above £8,000,000 as a balance in cash from the American Union, besides a large balance in useful produce chiefly. This year the figures are wonderfully altered. The balance in our favour is only £1,866,716! This is not because we have sent fewer goods to America; for we have sent upwards of three millions sterling in value more than we sent last year. We should therefore have had to that extent more money from them, had there been no other disturbing cause. It is not because we have received more cotton, for we have received, in value, some four millions sterling less than in 1868. We have received a large increase in grain—as much as three millions in value more of that useful article than during last year; but that does not account for so unfavourable a balance in coin. Have we not an indication here of a drawback that will soon tell far more terribly on this country than it has ever yet done? Capital owned in this country is seeking investment in America. Our capitalists are lending largely to the United States, and enabling workmen to do that in the country to which they have emigrated which was wont to be done in this country. If labour in this land keeps the incubus of which we have spoken still hanging on its neck, it is perfectly certain that it will not be able to compete

with younger nations in their ports; and accumulated wealth, as capital is, really will find its way out of the country. Keep up an expenditure of one hundred and fifty millions a year—at the same time lessen production—and it will follow, with unerring sureness, that we shall be left dying of starvation in the rear of other peoples. The ruin of a nation is not a result which shows itself all at once. It is the issue generally of a comparatively slow process; but it is not the less surely, because it is slowly, that a people who send off their most industrious workmen to increase the forces of other nations who are already competing with them for the world's trade, do come to ruin by such a course. It should not be forgotten that just the more favourable the conditions of labour are in the countries to which we send out our workmen, just so much the sooner will our adversity come to us from their competition. Prosperity can come only by keeping our strength as high and our production as full as can be reasonably secured.

CHAPTER XXX.

“CHEAPENING LABOUR.”

THERE is one feature of the result of clearing men off the land which is closely connected with forced emigration, and supremely worthy of study by those who care for their country's future. It was brought under public notice lately in an able pamphlet by Councillor Dugald Campbell of Greenock. The facts stated by this gentleman are of the most startling and terrible character, in relation to the dreadful overcrowding of the town in which he resides. Mr. Campbell sees all the evil in the reduction of wages, caused by the influx of Irishmen and Highlandmen into Greenock, and speaks of “the eviction of Irish tenantry” and “evictions in the Highlands” as the great causes to which this influx is to be ascribed. His mind's eye is filled, to the exclusion of all beyond, with this reduction in the wages of the labourer, because of this influx of the Celtic race “throwing a large surplus of unskilled labour into the market, reducing its price,” and bringing the whole labouring class to the verge of beggary, so near that a few days of idleness from the severity of the weather throws on charity. We must look at more than one perplexing point when such ideas as those of this

worthy councillor are put before us. Here, for example, we are told that an increase of willing workmen issues in poverty to the whole mass of the labouring population of a stirring, thriving seaport! Here is yet another strange thing—a cheapening of that labour on which the sustenance of the whole people depends brings the mass of that people to the borders of ruin! Does this accord with natural law? Mr. Campbell, along with multitudes, evidently thinks that it is in the nature of things that an influx of labour, such as makes it more easily purchased, is a bad thing, at least for the labouring population. He deprecates the influx and the cheapening.

Let us see whether this is the result of looking at the case in its proper light. Suppose we take as our illustration a coal-field within easy reach of Greenock as a place of export. A mine has been opened in that field, we shall say, and a few miners are at work, so that a few tons of coal are coming weekly to the surface. A few horses and carters are engaged in carting these coals to Greenock, and some small vessels, manned by a few sailors, are engaged in conveying these coals to Ireland, and to the Highlands and Islands of Scotland. In this state of things a very great deal is necessarily expended in getting a very few coals brought to their ultimate destination. The miners are lowland Scotchmen, and require, we shall say, twice as much to sustain them as Celtic workmen do. It is the same with all the other men

employed, and so also with the horses. The consequence of this is, that where the coals are wanted they are very scarce and very dear. The rich may have them, but even the moderately poor can have none. So far as coals are concerned, the poor are poor indeed when this is the way. We are here only describing an actual state of things.

But now let us suppose that somehow a lot of Celtic labourers come over to the coal-work, and some Irishmen bring over some of their hardy, active horses with them. Even Irish and Highland sailors offer themselves. Both men and horses can live on half, or less than half, of that required to sustain the lowland races. They can easily do as much work with half the expenditure. Here is a dreadful calamity, according to popular ideas; and we must admit it may not be *just at first* favourable to the lowland workmen or their cattle. If these have got luxurious and lazy, they may find that a class of men and horses, who are neither the one nor the other, distance them in the race of life. But something like double the coal will find its way to "the far end," and it may be that not far above half the price per ton will suffice to buy it. Let this process go on, and ten times the coal will find its way where it is wanted. This will make a very different state of things prevail there, at least so far as fuel is concerned. If in any way it presses upon some of the people on this side of the water, it surely cannot also beggar those on the other side. If you lay down two tons of

coal at a man's door for what was before the price of one, he will be a strange man who will think you mean to bring him “upon the parish!” For one man on this side who has his wages reduced by this process, there will be twenty on the other side whose condition in life is benefited. And if it should be hard to persuade the one of this truth, it need not be so hard to convince the twenty. But such is the natural and necessary effect of “surplus labour,” as it is called, and the reduction of wages. It is inevitably, so far as it goes, the increase of produce, and the lessening of expenditure in its production: it is, in other words, inevitably, so far as it goes, *the enriching of the community as a whole*. You may as well try to prove that a square is a circle, as to gainsay this certain truth. Increase expenditure and lessen production, and you will be poorer with a certainty that belongs to the most sure of all assurances. Lessen expenditure and increase production, and riches will increase more surely, if possible, than the sun will rise and set to-morrow, or the tide ebb and flow. How perfect, then, must be the delusion which ascribes to “surplus labour” and a reduction of the cost of production, the pauperism of the masses!

But our illustration is not complete. Coals are not sent to Ireland and our Highlands and Islands merely that the Irish and the Highlanders may have good fires. Neither are they sent that *money* may be brought over in return. Our Celtic brethren are

not in the position to give us gold to any great extent. But they are in a much more noble position than if they were able to send us ever so much of the "precious metals." They are able to live on so little, and to produce so much more than they devour, that they can send us enormous quantities of both food and clothing, and these, too, of a quality of the highest character. The coal we send from our mines is exchanged for grain and food, as well as clothing, of the richest quality. The more plentiful we can make their fuel, the more labour they can give to the soil and the loom, and the more produce they can and do send us. Now, stop a little, working man. We know you are bursting to tell us something here; but we know it already, and will soon tell you it, as some would say, "in the deafest side of your head." Just wait a little. Mind, what we say is true. The more coal you send to Ireland and the Highlands, the more butter, and ham, and eggs, do the Irish and the Highlanders send over here. The cheaper labour is in Greenock, the cheaper coal is in Dublin and elsewhere, and the cheaper, and more plentiful too, will grain and all else that depends on Irish soil and Irish labour be on this side the channel. This is surely a strange way of increasing pauperism. The expense of production is made low, the amount of produce is made high, and the result is starvation and beggary! Surely there must be something far wrong here.

It is extremely difficult to make the labouring

man understand this, hence we need to dwell on the point a little. Take, then, a Highland farmer—say at present he can have no coal—that useful mineral is beyond his reach in price. He and his family must dig their fuel from the bog far up the mountain side. The time and strength given to this is deducted from such labour as would greatly increase his grain crops and also his flocks on the hill. A change comes, in which he soon finds out that it is greatly better to give labour to corn and mutton, and exchange these for coal; and he soon sends a goodly quantity of these across to bring him the desired fuel. Just as coal is cheapened to him, so is his produce cheapened to the miners by this process. Their benefit is as sure as his. Yet a process which has brought this about in a high degree is given as the reason why so many affected by it are reduced to helpless poverty! What is the true explanation?

Now for it, poor toiling reader. We shall tax your patience no longer. You want to ask us how it is that the poor colliers do not get the grain, mutton, ham, and eggs, as they used to do. Coal is more abundant, and food and clothing are more abundant too, as the result of lowered wages; but the abundance goes hand in hand with an increase of misery and destitution among the labouring millions. They do not profit by the very abundance which they produce. Why? Surely it would be monstrous to answer that it is because of that abundance, and the lowness of expenditure in pro-

ducing it. We need no such absurd explanation. One sufficiently flagrant and dreadful is at hand.

Now, mark, kind reader, what we say. It is not intemperance that accounts for the horrid anomaly of cheap and abounding labour increasing pauperism. Mr. Campbell does not spare intemperance. He is, every bit of him, a manly man, and spares nothing so far as he sees anything in his way. But he has missed the mark, notwithstanding, and has left the main thing out of account. Let us illustrate what we mean. Suppose, instead of whisky and tobacco being sold as they are now, that oatmeal were dealt with in the same fashion, and that the people used oatmeal to about the same extent as they use these narcotics. What would be the difference as to pauperism? That which now costs two-thirds of a penny in oatmeal would cost a shilling—that is really about the proportion of value to price in the case of whisky and tobacco, putting the two together, —two-thirds of a pennyworth are sold for a shilling to the labouring man. Well, let it be so, not with these articles, but with oatmeal, and let about the same money be spent on oatmeal at that rate as is spent on whisky and tobacco now. There would be a difference; but what would be the effect as regards the comfort of the labouring masses, and their liability to pauperism? The use of oatmeal would not cause a loss of work, and consequently of wages, to the extent of seven shillings and sixpence a week, as is the case with liquor, nor

would it cause the sluggishness and consequent slackness of effort now caused by tobacco. Let these drawbacks, therefore, be carefully weighed, and placed to their proper account. They, no doubt, aggravate the evil before us, and let them have all the discredit which is their due. Oatmeal could have no such discredit. As we suppose the matter, it would only be the payment of a shilling for two-thirds of a pennyworth of the meal. That is, for every pennyworth of oatmeal purchased, the labourer would pay one shilling and fivepence for nothing! This is what they actually do for whisky and tobacco, and we are supposing that they should do the same thing for oatmeal. What would be the effect?

The amount of actual money paid over the counter at present for whisky, together with other liquors, and tobacco is above five pounds sterling to every soul in the country—it is considerably above this sum. Then, we take this as paid for oatmeal at the rate of a pennyworth for eighteenpence—that is, eighteen shillings for one shilling's worth—that is, eighteen pounds for twenty shilling's worth—that is, out of a single family of five persons, more than twenty pounds for about twenty-one shilling's worth of oatmeal! What would be the effect on the condition of the families purchasing their oatmeal at this rate? Even if the heads of those families had what are called good wages, how much of Irish and Highland produce would fall to their lot? To

whom would the butter, eggs, and ham of Ireland go? On whose backs would Irish linen be worn? For whom would the sheep and oxen of the Highland farms be sent over? Would it be for them, or for those to whom they paid their twenty pounds for twenty-one shilling's worth of oatmeal? Does it require a master intellect to say to whom the produce sent over in exchange for the fruits of their industry would go? How could it go to the men and their families from whom the money representing these fruits was swindled at the rate under consideration? Beyond all question the ham and egg, the butter and loaf, the salmon, and even the choice of the herrings, with linen and wool of the finest quality, would go to those who could sell a pennyworth of oatmeal for eighteenpence. The poor fools who gave them the money, with their wives and children, would have to shift with the refuse, or die.

Now, mark us well. We are keeping out of sight the enormous drawback of drinking and smoking in their effect on the productiveness of labour. That effect is very great, and aggravates the evil to which Mr. Campbell so graphically draws attention; but it is small compared with the actual money swindle. Consequently, who does not know to whose use the return produce of Ireland and the Highlands is now devoted? There is not a man, woman, or child, directly or indirectly, fed and clothed from the proceeds of this shameless affair

who has not enough and to waste of that very produce; while the families by whom it is won, who produce that which is exchanged for it, are on the borders of starvation, and actually dying by scores for want of wholesome food, clothing, and homes. Mr. Campbell says, "On coming across, often with large families, the Irish poor are compelled to seek homes at the lowest rents; and it is no uncommon thing to find eight or nine individuals occupying apartments suitable at most for two or three, and this in the worst localities, amidst a dissipated and degraded population, whose vices they rapidly imitate;" and he gives an instance of twenty-seven families, consisting of about 140 individuals, crowded into a space of 40 feet by 110 in a property under his own care. He tells us that it would be possible to carry out the Public Health Act in Greenock only by turning "thousands to the streets." But how can it be otherwise so long as these thousands are giving away their wages at the rate of eighteen-pence for a pennyworth? How can they pay rents or anything else in an adequate way?

We received lately an explanation of a very curious matter from one of our Ayrshire harbour masters. The matter was this. A great number of children are seen passing to this harbour before dinner time, carrying their parents' dinners for them. These children are seen begging from every available house and person on their way back. Their fathers are workmen of the hardest and most

efficient character, engaged in stowing the coals into the vessels in the harbours, a duty which no Scotchman can face. They have large wages, but then they give so many eighteenpences for single pennyworths, that while Government draws a large revenue, and liquor and tobacco dealers grow wealthy on them, their homes are execrable, and their ragged, almost naked, wives and children are beggars. It is too much for human forbearance to witness such monstrous cupidity in the name of the Queen, and by the hands of men who eat and drink themselves to death at the expense of these ignorant and helpless wretches! Mr. Campbell, like most others who write with half the courage and frankness that characterizes him, says:—"While other causes pauperize thousands, it (intemperance) demoralizes, pauperizes, and slays its tens of thousands;" but he does not seem to see that it is the swindle in money that is now associated with the liquor to which by far the largest share in the pauperism must be ascribed. Were it not for this, the aristocracy and middle classes of this country would not bear with the liquor traffic for six months. Were it not for the money, there is manhood enough in those classes to make them stamp out that horrid malady within that time. If it were not the money, at the rate we have stated, flowing to our upper classes through the liquor traffic, pauperism would be a trifle. Men might drink themselves dead on a few pence, and it

would come to little in the way of impoverishing their class. The labourers whose children beg on the way back from giving them their dinners could not hold as much liquor as would beggar them, if they drank all they could contain, were the liquor about a halfpenny a gill. But it is sevenpence, and hence they can drink all they win. This grand hypocrisy, perpetrated in the name of Government, and the restrictions of a traffic which can rob as it does now were its restrictions tenfold more stringent, must cease. It is fast strangling itself by the poverty and discontent it is creating; but men must not wait, or these dangerous social elements that will kill the liquor trade by their growth will have done so only in the death of the nation.

CHAPTER XXXI.

WHO IS TO BLAME?

IN our former chapters on the progress of social deterioration in Britain, we have said enough to show the dreadful character of the process now going on. It is time we should draw more closely up to the question as to who are responsible for this process. And, first of all, we must look the true character of the evil fairly in the face. We must settle the point, in accordance with truth, as to which end is the beginning and which the termination of that on which the process essentially depends. Is it that end at which we find the drunkard, or is it that at which we find the manufacturer of the liquor in the use of which men and women become drunkards? Let us illustrate what we mean. There is a quantity of dead and dying fish lying on the bank of a river, and an angler standing by them. There has been a process here by which these fishes, that were a little while ago swimming in the river, are now dead and dying on the bank. Whether did this process begin with the fish or with the angler? Remember we have the highest possible authority for the analogy on which we take up this illustration. Our Saviour said to those who were endeavouring to make their living by getting fish from

the Sea of Galilee, "*Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men.*" It is therefore clear that men can be caught just as fishes are. And when they are caught, and dead or dying on the bank, at which end did the matter begin? Was it at that of the fishes, or at that of the angler? No one needs to be told. Nor does any one need to be told at which end the matter begins in the case of alcoholic intemperance. Beyond all question it begins with the manufacturer of intoxicating liquor. It ends with the drunkard.

But we say again, let us face the question fairly. Is it the same with men as with fishes? Let us be careful not to take advantage of the enemy. How is a fish caught in angling? By a mistake. It bites a dressed hook instead of a portion of good fish food. How is a man caught in intemperance? By a mistake which is identical with that of the fish. He takes a drug which ruins, instead of a wholesome beverage. Perhaps you say that the cases are not identical, as there is intelligence in the man and not in the fish; but there is only a difference in that respect in degree, so that a bait must be somewhat more disguised in the one case than in the other. In the cases of a very great many human beings there is no more real knowledge of alcohol than there is of a baited hook on the part of a fish. The cases are much more similar than perhaps most men are ready to allow.

Every one knows (who knows anything at all on

the subject) that if you have a river stocked with fish, and have bait suited to their taste, you have only to cast that bait with some degree of skill on the water, with hooks concealed, and you will catch a portion of the fish that are there. But it is exactly the same with the liquor traffic. You have only to open a liquor shop with suitable liquors, and a number of any people on earth will there become drunkards. See, look down from that grassy bank on a large pool in that lovely river, and see the finny creatures enjoying life—as surely as you or some one else shall cast the suitable fly-hook on the surface of the pool so surely will one of those fishes be caught. Then look on that lovely village—we could name the pool, and we could name the place if need be—that village is full of sober men, women, and children. At present all is well with them, and drunkenness is unknown. Open a shop for the sale of alcoholic drink there, and let that hook from hell be only baited skilfully—as sure as that publican opens his door and offers his liquor, so surely shall there be drunkards in that village, and that within a very few month's time. The steady man will have become the reeling sot—the thrifty woman the demented drunkard—and even children will have learned to drink. There will be *delirium tremens*, and deaths in which perdition will have begun in the living here, ere the soul has left the body. He is culpably a fool who thinks for a moment of gainsaying this truth; and he is no better who will

talk about the "respectability" of the "houses" and of the "traders" who are to do this infernal angling among human souls. The greater that respectability only the better dressed are the hooks, and the greater numbers will be caught and destroyed.

Let us look at these "fishermen," not of Galilee, but of Pandemonium. "In the three kingdoms," we are informed on official authority, "there are about 6,000 malsters, 38,000 licensed brewers of beer, 3,000 dealers in beer, 85,000 publicans who retail beer with spirits, and 53,000 persons who retail beer alone." How many is that? One hundred and eighty thousand people engaged in this deplorable traffic. But this gives a most inadequate view of the multitude; for all the assistants in the traffic are left out. We have only the persons "licensed" to carry on, with all needed aid, this terrible business. These men pay £756,000 for "license" to ply their "fisheries"! This of itself is no mean sign of their importance and power to employ inferior hands. Such is a mere glance at our gigantic army of degradation!

Let it then be remembered that *not one* of all these thousands fails to make more or less of his fellow-men intemperate. Here comes in about the silliest talk in which even drunk men ever indulged, and it is apt to fall from teetotal lips. They say that people have only to shut their mouths and be a "Maine law to themselves, and all would be well!" It is every whit as sensible to say that salmon, by

shutting their mouths, or by keeping out of harm's way, might spare our legislators passing fishery laws! There is always a large proportion of the finny tribes who steer clear of the bait and of the nets too, and there are always men and women who do so as well; but just as certainly as there are and always will be a large proportion of fish not up to this, so there are and always will be many men and women in the same predicament in relation to liquor. There is no possibility of so enlightening every member of society as that the bait of liquor trading shall be thrown in vain; and if it were not for infamous avarice and deluded sensuality, no man's mind could be so blinded as to doubt that an immediate and most urgent duty is to arrest the system of degradation where it begins, so as to save an ignorant and easily misled people from destruction. The numbers drawn into drunkenness every year by 180,000 liquorsellers are incredible, and not to be measured for a moment by our police returns. In certain states of our police they hide everything they possibly can of the horrors of intemperance, and hence we get nothing like a fair idea of what is going on; but even these returns are sufficient to make the blood run cold in every benevolent heart. The heaps of helplessly drunken men and women laid out in our police cells on a Sabbath morning, like so many dead and dying fish on the land, show us, if we can be shown at all, how dreadfully successful the fishermen of liquordom constantly are.

How shall we characterize the temperance efforts hitherto patronized by the churches and also by the publicans themselves? They are like those of men who should go to the heap of dead and dying fish hauled out on the bank in order to put a few back into the water for decency's sake! In addition to this, perhaps, they should talk to the remaining denizens of the water, and advise to abstinence from the hook! Or, perhaps, going a little farther, they should be scrupulously careful as to the respectable character of the fishermen and their lines, so that fishing should not be allowed to grow a disreputable business! And yet they should protest that their desire is to save every fish from being drawn out of the water! Surely common sense would ask if they had not better stop the fishing by laying hands on the anglers?

And yet the greatest point of all would be as to whether the fish or the fishers should have the casting vote in the affair. Especially if the fishermen and those licensing them had something like a hundred and fifty millions sterling annually flowing into their coffers as the fruit of their fishing business, it would be very hazardous to submit the decision of the case to them. What an almost infinite foolishness does it argue among the masses of our countrymen that they can be fleeced to this extent, and yet listen to the sapient excuses of those who fleece them, as if these were the perfection of political wisdom!

CHAPTER XXXII.

WHAT IS TO BE DONE ?

It is unnecessary for us to go farther in considering the great and destructive wrong which is now inflicted on the great mass of the community by the liquor and tobacco traffic as at present carried on. We must look fully in the face the great question as to how that wrong is to be redressed, and in doing so we must look at the matter in its foundations. Perhaps it is the best that a set of timeservers can do, even at the head of a British Empire, to legislate as the state of mind in Parliament will allow ; but it is the part of the people to find fresh legislators, if the state of those now in power is incompatible with righteous measures ; and it is the duty of those who would instruct their fellow-creatures to show what ought to be done, and what will be done as soon as the mass of the constituency resolve that so it shall be.

We shall find it impossible logically to begin short of putting down the abuse of the land. It will be necessary to make the man who lays down his fields in barley, for the express purpose of selling the grain to the liquor maker, feel that he is farming in antagonism to the weal of society, and that it is necessary that society should place itself

in antagonism to him. Till it is believed to be a crime against the community to devote as much arable land as is in all Scotland to the raising of intoxicating drink, so that such a crime will be placed in its true position, we shall not have got to the bottom of the affair with a radical cure. But this will come far more strongly upon the owners of property than upon mere tenants. The man who gives surface, or houseroom, to the distiller, brewer, or publican, will be the party most easily and justly reached by law when men become duly awake to this vast wrong. If our present authorities cared a straw for the suppression of illicit liquor selling and brothel keeping, they would *forfeit* to the state every room let for these purposes. The owner of property who will take money in order that his property may be used against the public weal, is unworthy of that ownership, and in true law would be denuded of his claims to all property so abused. Men will have no difficulty on this point so soon as they really mean to suppress these terrible wrongs against mankind. The present system of dealing with so-called illegal matters of this kind is a transparent sham. A bailie, for example, wishes to see, and to let one or two of his friends see, through our "night houses." The intelligent officer of police, who is told off to take them through, can show all as easily as he could take them through the Exchange! It would be as easy to suppress every one of these

places through the owners of the property as it is to raise the right hand; but that is not wanted. Every gill of liquor, and every ounce of tobacco, used in these places, is so much wealth to those who as yet are allowed to hold the reins. But this must be changed, and as soon as an indignant people make up their minds to act for their own defence, it will be changed. Aye, and the change will *begin with the owners of property*. That must be held and used for the public good, or not held at all. The doctrine has become essential to national life, and it cannot long lie in abeyance.

The manufacturer of liquor will come next to the owner of the surface devoted to wrong. It is surely near about long enough that the masses have been taught to regard our distillers and brewers as among their benefactors. The benefaction that takes, in company with Government, some two shillings from poor drunkards for a pennyworth of liquor, has surely about had its day. He who takes the bread from the mouths of starving thousands to convert it into the poor drunkard's drink, must be placed in his proper category as a malefactor, and not a benefactor. At present, a man is hunted like a wild beast if he distil for his own profit without sharing his gains with an avaricious government; but this stipulation and its purchase of license to commit one of the most flagrant of wrongs must cease. Such a thing, some say, is hopeless with our present rulers. Then we must have other rulers.

The government of this country is of the people's choosing, and if the people do not choose such men as are capable of putting down the greatest iniquity of the day, they will now have themselves to blame.

But the importation and sale of liquor must share the fate of its manufacture. Smuggling is next to obsolete now, because it is so highly the interest of rulers in this country to suppress it. It requires only a similar vigilance in the interests of society to that now in the interests of rulers, in order to its being impossible to carry on the trade in liquor in any form. It is absurd in a high, if not in the highest, degree to imagine that, under a system under which it is each year increasing, the ruinous traffic to which we are calling attention is to be removed. There must be a downright honest effort to put the monstrous system down, if we are ever to be delivered from it.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

OWNERS' RIGHTS.

IN the present state of society in the United Kingdom, it is necessary to establish the right of any movement in order to its success. This is so far a happy social condition. It is, however, still only too manifest that the right on one side is very much more embodied in law than that right on another side. The owner of land has a power in virtue of that ownership which is denied to the owner of life in virtue of his ownership. Let us look in this chapter to the legalized claim of the owners of land in relation to the liquor traffic. So far as we have heard, no one thinks of complaining against proprietors who, to so great an extent, have banished the traffic in strong drink from their neighbourhoods. Some may, perhaps, regard their action as rather severe and arbitrary; but no one proposes to dispute their legal right to do as they have done. The law, at least, fully protects them from all interference in the matter. Those feuers, for example, on the Grange estate in Edinburgh,—many of them spirit-dealers who have got the money with which they have built fine villas on that estate by spirit-dealing,—who have clauses in their feu-contracts forbidding, in all time coming,

the sale of intoxicating liquor on that property—no one questions either the right or the wisdom of such a prohibition. The estate is laid out for villas, and to open a public-house in one of those beautiful rows would go far to damage the property over the whole estate of the Grange. To live at some considerable distance from a liquor-shop is a privilege which even the liquor-seller values highly. And when he is able to plant his villa in such a locality as the Grange, he takes as good care as other men that no one shall destroy its amenity by opening such a nuisance as a tavern in the vicinity. However much some may laugh at his inconsistency, no one will question either his legal right or his good sense in thus effectually prohibiting his own business from encroaching upon the neighbourhood of his home. As a proprietor of land he has this power in law, and he uses it wisely. Our Home Secretary, who speaks of the “injustice” of giving two-thirds of the ratepayers in a district the legal power to do for their homes what these very spirit-dealing proprietors do for theirs, has no idea that the prohibition by owners of land is an injustice. The proprietor who banishes the liquor-shop from his estate, merely because his coachman gets tipsy in that house, commits no injustice in Mr. Bruce’s eyes, and needs no action of the “government” to restrain him; though any number of the poor who own no land or houses, and who are ruined by the influence of the liquor-seller on their families, would commit an

“injustice,” which the “government” must not allow, should they suppress the grand cause of their misery. We must look this matter fairly in the face, and study it thoroughly. It is clearly part of our law which no government can alter, that owners of property may *prohibit* the sale of intoxicating liquor on that property, however extensive it may be. The Duke of Argyll, for instance, may prohibit such sale in the island of Tiree, and our Home Secretary will never so much as dream of rendering such prohibition illegal, or of calling it “injustice.” We are disposed to reiterate this truth, because it is one of very great moment in our present controversy. It goes to demonstrate that there is no “injustice” in the prohibition of the liquor traffic considered in itself. It is worthy of all legal protection if it is the doing of landowners on their own land. No one imagines such a thing as a bill to compel the Grange feuers to allow a liquor-shop to be opened among them for the accommodation of drinkers. This is a point of incalculable importance. All talk about the essential tyranny of prohibition is talk only, and heartless talk too, so long as it is conceded as both legal and just that more than twelve hundred parishes in Britain are cleared of liquor-shops now, by the will of the landowners over these parishes. That never can be an injustice or an oppression in itself which may be legally and justly done by any one. Yet this very thing is legally and justly done by many thousands—only these are owners of land.

Does it then become an injustice and an oppression when it is done by those who are not owners of land? One man legally, and without any injustice, removes the traffic from among hundreds because he owns the soil on which they live; is it an injustice if two men, for the protection of themselves and their families, remove it from within the reach of one, merely because these two men do not own land?

This question gives rise to reflections which must now assume an importance such as they have not had hitherto in these realms. Up till 1832 the people of this country were governed exclusively by the owners of land. Up to this present we have been governed exclusively by the owners of property, though that property was not exclusively land. Now the predominant voice in the empire is that of those who own neither land nor property in any great measure. The actually dominant class now are owners chiefly of wives and children, with heads and hands consecrated to their welfare. The dominant right hitherto in the empire has been that of *owners*,—that right now is the right of *occupiers*. He is a blind man who does not see this, and he is not a wise man who does not make up his mind for its consequences. When the farmers in last election turned the Earl of Dalkeith out of Parliament, and that prince of Scottish landowners, his father, felt the mortification natural to a truly fatherly man at such a time, was he not blind if he saw not that another hand than that of the landowner now holds

the sceptre in Scotland? When the farmers in Perthshire set aside one of the noblest of landowners in a similar way, did not he see the change? And though some of our most worthy and liberal legislators still are owners of land and of other property to a large extent, who does not see that they occupy their seats in the House of Commons, not by means of, but in spite of the large owners in the country? The Prime Minister himself is no exception to this. He is the rejected of South Lancashire, and the elected of Greenwich! Now, then, is the time for the discussion of rights that can no longer be allowed on one side and disallowed on the other. We cannot, even if we would, let owners of land claim a monopoly of such a privilege as that of legally prohibiting a traffic which is a nuisance to them, and deny, at the same time, occupiers the same legalized right of prohibiting that same traffic, while it is an almost infinitely greater nuisance to them. Sir Wilfrid Lawson is the representative of the rights of occupiers in this matter in the House of Commons. The Home Secretary is the representative of the exclusive privilege of owners. The one is the advocate of popular rights, the other is, in reality, the advocate of a proprietary monopoly. The one is a man of the opening era, the other is a man of the past. In Sir Wilfrid's mind those who own nothing but their wives and families have prohibitory rights as dear as those who own thousands of acres; and he has taken up the advocacy of their rights

as his life-work. Mr. Bruce sees not one of these rights—he sees only those of the classes hitherto dominant, but dominant no longer; and he denounces as an injustice on the part of two-thirds of the community that which he upholds as the right of one man—only because they are but occupiers, and he is an owner.

It would surely be a gross mistake to imagine that ownership of land gives a peculiar right to protection from an evil, and that the ownership of life, and of other living beings, gives no such right. If a man is the rightful owner of land, he is entitled to protection in the rightful use of his property; but on the same principle is the owner of anything else. It is therefore a great step in the direction of social deliverance from a great curse that the law enables proprietors to clear it out of their houses and off their lands.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

OCCUPIERS' RIGHTS.

WE come now to consider the right of that part of society which *occupies* but *does not own* any land. Before we can take up this, however, it would seem well (as we have strongly now before us the legalized right of a small minority) to consider the question of *right as that stands related to the points of majority and minority*. It is a favourite doctrine of those who oppose the demand of two-thirds of the ratepayers to prohibit the sale of liquor in a parish, that such prohibition would be a tyranny of a majority over a minority which justice could not sanction. Tom and Dick, it is argued, have no right to say to Harry that he shall not have a convenient public-house because they are two-thirds and he is only one-third of the party interested in the business. If, it is admitted, Harry owns the land on which the trio live, he has the right to say to Tom and Dick that they shall not buy liquor there, however inconvenient the matter may prove to them. Being in the majority, in fact, is held to be nothing in the way of right, and ownership to be everything. It is worth while to illustrate this point somewhat fully. We happen to know an island which has a population of some thousand souls, but

is the property exclusively of one man. Two places for the common sale of liquor used to be licensed on that island, in spite of the remonstrances of the vast majority of the people. The landlord of the island was a most kind and considerate man, and at last he consented to suppress one of the licenses. This made matters considerably more profitable for the man who owned the remaining house, but not a whit better for the people. Still they remonstrated; but in vain. Their young men were led into drunken habits in this licensed house; but, on the ground that there ought to be a place for the sale of liquor on the island, they were refused all redress. At length the landowner took a special interest in two or three of the more promising young men of the place, and meant to make something worth while of them. These young men were caught in the publican's trap, and began to come home in the morning instead of in the evening, not at all the better for their night's patronage of the publican. The leading heads of families had now their opportunity, and they sent a deputation to the landowner, informing him of how his good designs were being frustrated. *He suppressed the license at once.* It was nothing that any number of fathers and mothers should have their hopes blasted merely that some thirsty soul should have his glass, but it was *everything* if the *protégés* of the proprietor of the land should be in danger of becoming a disappointment. Now, is it possible, in the state of politics which at

length prevails, that such cases as this should fail to raise effective questions of right between man and man, and especially between the minority which has ceased to rule and that majority which has taken its place in the seat of power? No man who is less than hopelessly blind to the great political change which has recently taken place can shut his eyes to the urgency with which such questions will now demand consideration and settlement. You speak of the injustice of majorities in such a matter as that now before us; but here is a case (and it is one of thousands) in which one vote takes the liquor sale away from among many hundreds. Is the sole right of the landowner so potent that he legally sets at defiance the claims of thousands; and are the rights of occupiers so worthless that thousands of their votes can weigh as nothing against that of even one? Is it likely that a constituency, the vast majority of whom are occupiers and not owners, will long consent to answer this question in the affirmative? Is there a spirit of bondage low enough in the constituencies of Great Britain and Ireland to allow these constituencies long to adhere to the law in that state in which it proclaims the voice of one man omnipotent in a social question like this against the voices of any number who are immeasurably more deeply concerned in it than he? It may, no doubt, be said that these questions broach revolutionary doctrines, that they smell of communism, and all that sort of thing; but it is only absurd to

talk so. The questions are forced on us by those who insist on the absolute supremacy of the mere landowner in a matter in which it is not the owner, but the occupier, who is not an owner, who has the chief stake. There are two fathers, who have families of sons and daughters as dear to them as any can be. They see that the seductions of the public-house are proving too much for their grown-up young people. They petition the "justices;" but all in vain. Their landlord finds his gamekeeper rather out of sorts with liquor when he wants his services—he suppresses the license. The fathers may be ten instead of two—they may be ten times ten; but it is all one to the "justices"! The landlord is only one man with interests in the case almost infinitely inferior to theirs, but he suppresses at once! He does not need to consult the "justices"! He is in the minority; but that goes for nothing! All this is in perfect accordance with a constitution in which owners alone have legalized rights, and in which occupiers have no voice in the legislation and government of the realm; but it is absurd in the extreme when every householder has his fair share in the choice of the supreme council of the empire. Where the majority have the power they will deserve to be drunken slaves if they fail to demand the same right to protect themselves and their children from overpowering temptations as is now enjoyed by the owners of land in their smallest minorities.

But this leads us to the true doctrine of the majority in relation to the minority. In considering this, we are not called upon to speak of the actual right of the occupier as related to that of the owner. We have not yet entered on the direct consideration of the right of the occupier at all; but we see that majority and minority are alike disregarded in the matter of landowners' right to suppress the liquor traffic. It has just as little to do in the matter of occupiers' right to have such a traffic suppressed. Actual right is never a matter of majority, nor is it one of minority. Neither is it a matter of land-owning, nor is it one of land-occupying without owning. The actual right of an individual man can never be affected in its nature by the number or social position of his fellow-men. If a man has a right to sell intoxicating liquor to his fellow-creatures, no majority, however great, can nullify that right; and if a man has the right to have the temptation and nuisance of a public-house removed from his neighbourhood, no power on earth can righteously license that abomination there. The majority which should consist of everybody but himself, would only commit the greater wrong who should place that fruitful source of all evil near that man's home because they happen to be in so great a majority. He is sadly mistaken who thinks that the United Kingdom Alliance prosecutes its great object as a matter, the right of which depends on the will of a majority. The Irish Church Bill is

carried through the House of Commons by above a hundred of majority. The Permissive Bill of Sir Wilfrid Lawson is thrown out by a similar majority. What Alliance man imagines that this is proof of the *right* in the one case, and of the *wrong* in the other? We repeat—majority and minority have nothing to do with the actual right. And yet, who does not see that majorities in the long run must decide what shall be *the law*?

Where, then, is the true place for majorities and minorities in their effective relation to each other? Simply where those who have equally precious individual rights are not all of one mind as to what these rights are. In all such cases the majority must decide what shall be actually done. The minority will in such cases think itself in the right; and the majority will think itself in the right; but the question, when it comes, is not what is right, but what is to be done? Which judgment is to prevail? Beyond all sane questioning, it must be the vote of the majority that must be followed out. That vote may be mistaken, but it is in the experience of the world that the voice of the majority fairly taken is the most safe in all truly debated affairs; and hence it is always followed. If as many as two-thirds of the householders in any neighbourhood conclude that it would rid all concerned of a vile curse to put away the liquor traffic from that neighbourhood, he is a hardy champion of drink who will insist that their judgment ought to be disregarded. And what

is perhaps better to our purpose, he is utterly foolish who imagines that, when every householder is in possession of a vote in the election of the legislature itself, a majority of such voters will long keep men in St. Stephens who deny them so important a privilege as that of ridding the neighbourhood of their homes of the nuisance of the liquor traffic.

We come now to the question of right on the part of occupiers who are not owners of land—that is, to the rights of all members of society, irrespective of ownership of the surface on which that society exists. We can barely broach the most fundamental of these without encroaching upon questions that are of the most delicate character as our country now stands. For example, if a human being is to exist at all, he must have leave to be somewhere on the surface of the globe; but this very self-evident truth touches in its vitals the imaginary right of “*eviction*” by the owners of land. It compels a logical and honest mind to look at the “*clearances*” that have been made over many hundreds of square miles, on which human beings are refused space on which to exist, in order that other beings may have scope to thrive where men have for ages thriven. It will be very difficult, no doubt, to convince a landowner that he has not absolute title to his land; and that the claim to exist, on the part of his fellow-men, who have no land, limits his right. But it is not the conviction that makes the truth, nor is it the conviction of the

owners of land which is henceforth to make our law. It is rather the conviction of occupiers than that of owners which is dominant, as we must often repeat; and hence it is of vast moment that on all sides the truth as to real right should be fully known. Why should any man shut his eyes to the manifest verity that the right of eviction on the part of owners of land is a limited right? If even bare existence is a right of every human being born into this world, then space on the earth's surface to live on is as certainly the right of that human being: and he who owns that surface should remember that there is a Superior above the Queen, to whom every landowner is responsible.

But even in order to existence, more is absolutely necessary than mere space on the surface of the land. Food, clothing, and shelter are as essential to bare life as space on the earth. If it is rendered impossible for any one to find adequate food, clothing, and shelter, he might as well be put to death at once. If any man, by owning the land, had the right to destroy the produce of that land, so that his fellow-creatures could not procure adequate food, clothing, and shelter, then that landowner would have the right to put these people to death. If they have the right to live, then they have the right to insist that the land and its produce shall be, to a certain extent, accessible to them. We cannot doubt that this palpable truth raises political questions of the most vital character, and that the answers which

those questions must receive will not agree with the notions that mould our present law-making; but there is no escaping from their cogency. They must be raised, and answered too. If the masses submit to be killed off as they are at present by the action of those who should nourish and cherish them, and that when the legislature of the realm is of their choosing, we can only say that they deserve to perish. But we have no fear for them. The truth must now come into action. Here, then, we insist that bare existence to the mass of society is impossible if the present system of licensed liquor traffic goes on. Such food, clothing, and wholesome shelter as are essential to bare life cannot possibly be enjoyed by the whole people if that system continues. Let us be careful, however, and not make such an assertion without adequate proof. We deal here with the manufacture of intoxicating liquor, and the destruction of food in that manufacture. That food is the produce of land, owned by a small minority of the human race, and is the property, in the first instance, of these landowners; but, in the nature of things, if that food is not to reach the mouths of the masses as wholesome nourishment, they must die. If they have a right to live, they have a right to insist that it shall so reach them. What, then, is the present state of the case? In 1868, the grain used in the manufacture of intoxicating liquor amounted as we have seen to 60,000,000 bushels of as good

and wholesome food as man or beast need desire to consume. We have the best authority for asserting that this immense consumption of grain produced neither food, clothing, nor shelter for any human being. Now, our question at this point goes to the very core of the subject in hand—Have those who own the land, and consequently the bread of the country, *a right* to use that land and food in this way? Then they have the right to starve the people to death if they so choose! If they may destroy this immense quantity of food, they may, of course, destroy double or treble the quantity, and so put to death any number of the population! Have they the right to do so? Who does not see that no man can have the right to do that which involves of necessity the death of his fellow-men? And who can contemplate the destruction of such a mass of grain as this in twelve months, amid a people thousands on thousands of whom are starving for bread, without seeing that, instead of exercising a right which the law is bound to respect, those who destroy this grain are committing a crime which, if law is not to remain a sham, it must restrain? If society has no right to restrain this, then it follows that society, as such, has no right to bare existence in the country, or on earth!

But, as we have said, mankind have a right to more than food if they have a right to live. In this climate, at least, they cannot even live without suitable clothing and shelter. In the present state

of the liquor traffic, it is impossible they can have these. That same minority who are now responsible for the licensed destruction of the grain we have mentioned, are responsible for an expenditure of *far* above a hundred million sterling a year on drink. This enormous sum represents labour chiefly; it is composed in by far its largest proportion of the wages of the labouring classes. Every one knows how the classes above the labouring millions plume themselves on the absence of drunkenness from their social circles; and all who know the truth of the case know that the immense sum to which we now direct attention is made up, in more than nine-tenths of its total magnitude, of money spent on liquor by those who can least afford so to spend. This money is drawn from the mass of the people by a seductive system of traffic which is manifestly irresistible in its fascinating power over many, many thousands in any large population among whom it is introduced. It has a much more powerful fascination than gambling, which is suppressed now by the imperative will of the state. Our assertion is, that with above a hundred and fifty millions a year all spent on liquor and tobacco, it is utterly impossible that the people, as a whole, can be adequately clothed and sheltered. We have, as we have seen, districts on which above 600 persons sleep on the square acre of surface as the result of its being utterly impossible that such classes can pay for both drink and house-room. We have far more numerous districts in

which, though the crowding is not so fearful, it is sufficient to secure a death-rate more than fourfold—and even more than sixfold—what it ought to be. These multitudes are actually clothed in “filthy rags,” and it is impossible, with a drain like that before us, they can be otherwise clad. Is there a man living who will insist that any government on earth has *a right* to treat its subjects in the way in which the license and revenue laws now treat the drinking thousands of our fellow-countrymen? As much as a shilling is taken now for less than two-thirds of a pennyworth of liquor from our labouring masses by the liquor-trading class, who have the sanction of Government to the robbery, on condition that the ruling class has the lion’s share of the prey! Is this the result of *a right*? This incredible robbery is actually putting to death a large portion of the infancy of the nation, because of the impossibility of those robbed to provide for their offspring. *Have men a right to do this?* Does the ownership of land, or of money, or of Governmental authority, give men a right, if they so choose, to carry on a traffic which thus withers in the bud a vast number of those who would otherwise be the productive people of future generations? Has no one but a landowner on his own land a right to say this shall be made to cease?

CHAPTER XXXV.

PALLIATIVE MEASURES.

ONE of the most instructive aspects of the present and past in the liquor traffic is presented by the results of efforts to lessen the evil effects of the business. Not far from five hundred Acts of Parliament have been passed with this benevolent object in view! Legislative patience and perseverance in the case seem utterly inexhaustible! Alas for human nature, these legislative virtues are only too easily explained on very commonplace theories. Political and philosophic men are found in sturdy combat with a view to decide whether alcoholic thirst is increasing or abating—or whether alcohol is being consumed per head of the population in a greater or less degree, while both seem oblivious to the truth that you may beggar a man on half the drink as fast as upon the whole if you more than double the money which you take out of him for the stuff.

Let us see how the case stands when we go back to about 1850, before the idea of raising the duty on spirits took much effect in legislation. Whisky was then sold over the counter at threepence a gill, the same as is now sold at sixpence. We have tables supplied by Government before us giving us

the progress of affairs in this matter from the year 1851 up to 1869. These tables enable us to see the rapid rate at which the spirit bill of the masses has been effectually doubled in amount. In 1853, £590,000 was laid on—in 1854 (foreign spirits), £16,694, and (home spirits) £450,000, at the same time that £2,450,000 was taken as a war tax on malt. In 1855 (colonial spirits), £25,546, and £1,000,000 (home spirits). In 1858 (colonial), £9,000, and (home spirits) £280,000. In 1860 (British colonial), £357,966, and (home spirits) £1,000,000, besides licenses to the amount of £75,000. In 1861 little was done, nor in the following years was much added, but the annual duty from spirits (foreign and home) had risen from £7,562,461 in 1852 to £15,189,545 in 1869—that is, the income from this deplorable business, in this one department of spirits, has more than doubled—and as the price has doubled, the profits of those who are engaged in it have something like doubled also.

If we look at the consumption per head of the population this result very clearly appears. In 1853, the amount of spirits returned for home consumption was 1·1 gallons per head; in 1867 it was 0·98 of a gallon. But we are here comparing a prosperous with an unusually dull year. If we take 1855 and compare it with 1867, there is a decrease of only two hundredths of a gallon per head. We shall see, when we look to the malt, that the whole decrease is more than made

up by the increase in beer; but the truth is, that if the population were taken by census instead of being "estimated," there would be no decrease seen at all. We are shut up to the conclusion that the effect of a high duty imposed on spirits has been to double the ruinous expenditure of the masses who consume them in this deplorable way. It has risen from less than £20,000,000 a year to above £40,000,000. This is a curious way of mitigating the terrible poverty of the masses, so as to remove the evils of intemperance. It surely teaches us that our statesmen are strangely incapable of the trust committed to them, or it teaches us something which we should be still more slow to believe. Here is a course, proceeded with now for fifteen years at least, in which the one result is to increase the expenditure of the mass of the people to double the amount, while all the evils incident to liquor are, to say the least, as rampant as ever they were.

The case appears much more flagrant still when we turn to the consumption of malt. With the exception of the war tax, to which we have already alluded, the duty on malt has not been increased for many years, standing at 2s. 8½d. a bushel; but in the ten years from 1857 to 1866 inclusive, the amount charged with duty had risen from 39,127,388 to 50,163,487 bushels. Every bushel of that malt represents about thirty-six shillings taken from the drinker of the liquor who pays for it in the ordinary

way; take it at thirty-five shillings, and you have £19,864,978 added to the annual sum paid for drink of this nature under the ameliorating influence of "remedial measures" for the evils that are now draining away the last resources of the masses! The drinker pays at least sixpence a quart for such liquor as is made at the rate of two bushels of malt to the barrel of ale (that is the barrel of 36 gallons); and, calculated at that moderate price, the above is a great way below the annual addition made to his liquor outlay in ten years. This is surely the wrong way to mitigate the recklessness of the multitude, and to "raise their moral tone" so that they shall be less liable to the seductions of the beer shops; and yet men of high standing do assure us that the right thing is being done!

We must look at the tobacco outlay in the same aspect. No one will contend that there is any lessening of the amount consumed so far as this narcotic is concerned; but few consider the rate at which the poverty of the masses is being hastened to a terrible crisis by the expenditure caused by it. From 1853 to 1869, the yearly amount of tobacco entered for home consumption has risen from 29,564,695 lbs. to 41,719,500 lbs.—that is, an addition of 12,154,805 lbs. in that time. After the water is added, and the price paid for so much of it above threepence an ounce, is taken into account, we must calculate this at not less than six shillings a pound weight of the imported article. The Scotch tobacco-

nists profess to work at the rate of 40 per cent. of water, but a spinner tells us that he has spun it at the rate of 53 per cent. with his own hands. We are, when we consider all expense for pipes, lighters, &c., under the truth in taking the cost to the users at six shillings a pound. This is, then, an addition to the annual outlay, chiefly to the class least able to give it, of £3,646,441.

If we add these large additions to one another, we see how the measures at present in vogue are helping the masses of the people out of their deplorable condition! The sum is not less than £34,000,000 a year! It will be observed that in this we are neither taking in the wine of the upper class, nor are we counting the high price of their cigars. We are looking to the expenditure which is almost exclusively that of the toiling millions whose condition it is imagined has been ameliorated by the measures that have been applied. Surely it is time that we should open our eyes on the dreadful deception which is being practised in so-called "remedial measures." The number of licensed public houses reduced by more than a half of their number, as is the case with Glasgow, only throws the liquor trade into abler hands, and makes it more effective in robbing the masses. Restrictions as to hours of sale, and Sunday closings, have been demonstrated to be perfectly consistent with the vast increase of money-drain to which we here direct attention. Sanitary laws

against overcrowding are simply so much waste paper, unless the state pay the rents which the liquor traffic has rendered the masses incapable of paying. Punishments for intoxication, and for supplying the intoxicated with liquor, are all mere trifling when considered beside the enormous increase in swindled money constantly going on. It is the dreadful depression of condition which is the absolutely necessary effect of such an enormous robbery that lies at the root of all the social misery of the drink system. The poorer a man becomes, and the more hopeless, he becomes also the more reckless of all the consequences of his conduct; and unless we are prepared to cause this great robbery in money to cease, we may save ourselves the trouble of all patchwork, such as deals with mere twigs of the great Upas. There is no choice left to those who would deal honestly with this great wrong but that of cutting it down. Whether it is to be by the initiative of the rulers, or by the popular vote, that the work is actually to be done, this is what must be done, if the nation is to be saved. Time may be wasted, and a greater depth of social degradation reached by such measures as make a show of palliation; but so vigorous is the vitality in the system that it will laugh to scorn all that fails to deal with it as a capital crime against the social weal.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

THE DUTY OF WORKING MEN.

WE think that we have sufficiently shown that, one way or other, the liquor traffic at least must be suppressed. Measures such as will not merely seem fitted for such a suppression, but such as shall be so fitted indeed, must be carried through. We have also shown the right of the mass of the people to have such work done by those who bear rule over them. One important matter still remains to be considered. That is, the duty to be discharged by those who are specially affected by this terrible wrong, if they would be delivered.

The United Kingdom Alliance has done, and will yet do, great things in its proper sphere. So have kindred associations done good, and so will they, too, continue to do most important work. The grand task of the Alliance and its helpers has been to enlighten public thought—specially in what may be called the political portion of society, and no work ever undertaken has been better or more zealously done. Parliament has felt, and will yet feel more effectually, the force of the Alliance. So has the Government, and so will it more fully in days to come.

But there are duties of vast importance which no

society of the nature of the Alliance can possibly discharge—duties which working men can easily perform if they are so disposed. The Good Templars are setting an example in at least preparing for the discharge of these duties. They are taking up the cause of the entire suppression of the liquor traffic, on the principle that every man must do his part in that work personally and not by proxy. A paid agency is of the highest possible importance within certain limits, and the Good Templars show that they understand this; but when all the personal work to be done is left to paid agents in a matter of this character, these very agents are next to helpless. The money which might be sufficient to pay an adequate force in doing such work as is required now, is all gone, long since, into the hands of those who are opposed to everything that can really lessen or limit this terrible business. It is consequently impossible to do anything considerable beyond leading on the forces by mere money power. But the capacity for work has not gone with the money. That capacity still remains, and remains in such force that it has only to be organized and brought into action in order to the defeat of all the agency the enemy can possibly employ. This is just what the Good Templars are most effectually accomplishing. Some of our Electoral Associations and Alliance Auxiliaries are doing the same thing, though perhaps not on so perfect a method. Men who feel the vast importance of the effort are giving time

and personal toil, though not able to give money, and are doing wonders. This sort of agency has only to be extended in order to its being made sure that every man belonging to the now suffering orders shall know his duty in relation to this horrid system of legalized plunder.

What are called our Trades' Unions have a work to do here. It is infinite folly for men to organize their strength against those who supply them with the capital necessary to the success of labour, and to guard against every semblance of encroachment on the part of these men, while they leave in full play a robbery that deprives them of all chance of ever having any capital of their own. So is it infinite folly to talk of "co-operation" while they are co-operating with the publican and tobacconist to keep themselves and families so poor that co-operation on any really effective scale is utterly out of the question. Even if they will drink, and smoke too, is it not folly to pay one and even two shillings for a pennyworth of the stuff they consume at the very time when they are opposing to the death every shadow of reduction in their wages? A Trades' Council advising men to stand out all but to the starvation point against a reduction of a shilling a week or so, and keeping silence on a system that takes at the rate of ten shillings a week from every working family in the United Kingdom, is a frightful anomaly. Such a thing must cease to be possible by its being so fully

exposed as to make men ashamed of it. This exposure must be effected by the agency of working men themselves. As a rule, they will not listen to others on such a subject as this. The few who will listen, and who are getting light, must teach those who will not give ear to any but their fellows. The man who will continue to give two shillings for a pennyworth of drink, and a shilling for a pennyworth of tobacco, is the true "*black leg*," and he must be made to know that he is so by the agency of working men. The tables must be turned on the poor vain creatures who have hitherto ridiculed abstainers; and they can be so turned. It needs only a little manhood and the personal manifestation of it to accomplish the thing effectually. This manhood must be found under the waistcoats of working men. A working man will not shrink from the charge of drinking whisky, nor yet from that of smoking tobacco; but the dullest soul that ever smoked or drank, will draw himself deep into his shell if convicted of paying two shillings, or even one, for a pennyworth of rubbish!

Right ideas of those who maintain this system of robbery must be got into the minds of working men, and that in a great measure by the efforts of fellow-workmen. What a sight was it to see masses of these noble fellows in Glasgow, at last election, toiling like heroes to send three men into Parliament who snapped their fingers in the faces

of their constituents, when these petitioned to vote them liberty to suppress the liquor traffic! "*Three Liberals*," sent up to St. Stephens by the masses, to keep the tremendous incubus of this vile wrong tight around the neck of these very masses, in defiance of their petition, signed by 35,000 of their number!! We must find working men who are prepared personally to expose this immense mistake, so that it shall not be committed again. It is vastly better not to vote at all, than to vote Sham Liberals into the House of Commons, or even into a Municipal Council. If no man can be found with honesty enough in him to go to Parliament with the design of relieving the masses from this glaring wrong, it is the duty of working men to show that they will rather not be represented at all, than misrepresented by those who are prepared, above all things, to fleece them through these snares of liquor and tobacco. But we repeat that such sentiments must be cultivated by working men in the minds of their fellow-workmen. No one else can do it. Other men can reach a few of the more thoughtful of the working masses, but they reach only a few. These must deal with their fellows. No deliverance seems possible apart from that fellow-feeling which sways classes of human beings when influenced by those who form part of the class.

Looking at things as they are, and not as they ought to be, we cannot hide from ourselves the painful truth that a portion of our labouring

masses are sadly sunk in ignorance and vice. But even where these amount to one fourth of the whole population, as it is shown they do in Edinburgh, we need not be staggered because one in four are so situated. If we have three good men for one bad one our heads need not hang down surely. We see something more difficult to deal with than this fourth who have been taken captive by the enemy—it is the curious apathy which characterizes even that other fourth, or perhaps half, who constitute the better class of working men. A candidate comes forward to contest a seat in the Town Council, and tells the deputations who wait upon him that he will certainly vote against all motions for the suppression of the liquor traffic, and equally against all granting to the ratepayers of the power to suppress it. Another comes forward to oppose him, who pledges himself to do his utmost in the direction of deliverance. Because of some petty feeling in relation to the right man, four or five hundred working class voters stay away from the poll! This is a tremendous drawback on the cause of working men. It must be broken up, and that by the agency of working men. It is a childishness which never appears among the upper classes. They know that no man is perfect, and that they must look to what will secure their grand object amid all imperfections. Till working men rise to somewhat of the same common-sense

position, they will not be represented either in Parliament or anywhere else.

There is a small but noble band of upper class men whose eyes are open and whose hearts are warm in the great cause of social deliverance in which we have thus written. These find themselves sometimes awkwardly placed when mingling with their peers. So ever have those who have proved their country's hope in the day of its darkest trials. They have had to seek among the humbler orders that sympathy and aid which they have ever been denied among their own class. "The common people" have heard them gladly, but not so the higher orders. And yet they have been the truest friends of their class as well as of their kind. It is only for a short time that the rich can go along with a degenerating mass constituting the lower orders. Ruin comes as surely in the end to them as it does in the beginning to the poorest and the weakest when oppression is at the fountain head of wealth. The abstraction of a hundred and fifty millions sterling a year from the productive masses, with only drink and tobacco handed to them in return, cannot go on for many generations till rich and poor sink in one common ruin. Both the leaders and the led who constitute the army of rescue in this grand crusade will be seen, in days to come, to have been the true friends of all in their country.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 027 204 251 2